FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-124
Wednesday
27 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-124 CONTENTS *27 June 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Begins Removing Chemical Arms From FRG *[TASS]* 1
Washington Exhibits Soviet, U.S. Missiles *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Yazov Urges Warsaw Pact 'Rethinking' *[TASS]* 3
CEMA's Special Commission Meets in Moscow *[TASS]* 3
Moscow Views Hungarian Claims for Compensation *[Moscow Radio]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov 26 June Briefing on World Issues 4
  On Foreign Debt, Repayments *[TASS]* 4
  On Removing Baltic Nuclear Forces *[TASS]* 4
  Urges Solution to Angolan Conflict *[TASS]* 4
  No Israeli Report on Soviet Jews *[TASS]* 4
  Denies Kuril Free Trade Zone *[TASS]* 5
  On Soviet Asia-Pacific Policies *[TASS]* 5
  Notes Reports of Congress Delay *[TASS]* 5
East Berlin Embassy Views Two-Plus-Four Talks *[Cologne Radio]* 6
State Treaty on Unification Called 'Time Bomb' *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jun]* 7
Proposal for Limiting German Armed Forces Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 7
Results of German Unification Talks 'Contradictory' *[TASS]* 8
Shevardnadze Proposes German 'Transition Period' *[AFP]* 8
Soviet Delegate on Copenhagen CSCE Conference *[PRAVDA 23 Jun]* 9
Foreign Policy Aides View Future of NATO *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 22 Jun]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

General Powell Favors 'Cautious' Military Cuts *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jun]* 12
Primakov Meets With U.S. Political Scientists *[Moscow TV]* 12
Soviet Trade Officials Assess U.S. Talks *[Moscow TV]* 12
U.S., Soviet Historians Discuss Cold War *[TASS]* 14
Health Care Protocol Signed With U.S. *[TASS]* 14

China

Li Peng, Gorbachev April Meeting Reported On *[TASS]* 15
PRC Supervision Minister Visits Soviet Union *[Moscow International]* 15
Chinese, Vietnamese Relations Seen Improving *[Moscow International]* 16
Chunhawan Urges China on Cambodia Issue *[Moscow International]* 16
PRC Trade Exhibition Opens in Moscow 22 Jun *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jun]* 16
USSR-PRC Diplomatic, Military Experts Meet *[Moscow International]* 17

Northeast Asia

New Japanese Envoy to Moscow Interviewed *[Moscow International]* 17
  Edamura, Rogachev Discuss Ties *[TASS]* 18

Need for Cold War Japan-U.S. Treaty Questioned *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jun]* 18
  Said To Hamper Disarmament *[Moscow International]* 19
Reports of Gorbachev Pressuring DPRK Denied *[Moscow International]* 20
ROK Minister on Reducing Military Exercises *[Moscow International]* 20
ROK Accepts North's Proposal to Resume Talks *[Moscow International]* 20
Korean Solidarity Meeting Held in Moscow *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 21
DPRK, U.S. Scholars Meet in Pyongyang *[Moscow International]* 21

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Nuclear Threat to Asia-Pacific Region Examined *[Moscow International]* 21
Vietnam Plans To Suspend Work Force Abroad *[TRUD 22 Jun]* 21
Rogachev Talks With New Zealand Official *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 22

Near East & South Asia

Israel's Pledge To Change Policy Doubted *[Pogodin on Moscow International]* 22
Rescue Mission for Iranian Quake Victims Departs *[TASS]* 23
  Azerbaijan President Sends Condolences to Iran *[Baku Radio]* 23
  Sends Aid to Victims *[TASS]* 23
  Emergency Aid Continues *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jun]* 23
Armenia Sends Aid for Iran's Earthquake Victims *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 24
Afghanistan's Najibullah on 'Overcoming Crisis' *[TASS]* 24
Afghan Government Success Causes Rebels' Confusion *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Jun]* 25
  Troops Clear Band of Rebels *[Moscow TV]* 25
Ulyanovsk Mosque Named After Saudi King *[TASS]* 26
Significance of Hajj to Saudi Arabia Reviewed *[Moscow International]* 26

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Meets Mozambique's Finance Minister *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 26
Komplektov Receives Zimbabwe Official *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 26
South African Party Leader Interviewed *[Moscow International]* 26
South Africa's 'Pace of Reform' Unsatisfactory *[Moscow International]* 28

East Europe

Conditions for Stay of Troops in GDR Discussed *[TASS]* 28
Further on Hostage-Taker Killed in GDR *[East Berlin ADN]* 28
Unity, Division in East Europe Identified *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 29
Emerging Czechoslovak Political Scene Viewed *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 29
Claims to Vacated Base Camps in Hungary Debated *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jun]* 31
Aircraft Demonstration Flights in Romania Noted *[TASS]* 31
Shevardnadze, Yugoslavia's Loncar Exchange Cables *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Soviet Parliamentarians Arrive in Yugoslavia *[TASS]* 32

West Europe

European Council Meets on CSCE, Market Reforms *[TASS]* 32
Belgian Telephone Contract Removes 'Obstacles' *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]* 32
Petrovskiy Talks With Belgian Ambassador on UN *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 33
Finland's Nuclear Power Station Accident Examined *[IZVESTIYA 23 Jun]* 33
More on Finland's Suspension of Paper Deliveries *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 34
Greek Consultations Held on Europe Security *[TASS]* 34
Prunskiene Ends Visit With Greek Officials *[TASS]* 35
Ryzhkov Sends Condolences for Disaster in Turkey *[TASS]* 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev 'Trying To Clarify Attitude of Others' *[AFP]* 36
Medvedev Says Congress Will Start 2 July *[AFP]* 36
Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress 37
  Delegates To Register 29 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* 37
  Medvedev Chairs Working Group *[TASS]* 37
  Komsomol Secretary Views *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 37
Medvedev, Others Discuss Culture Policy *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 2 Jun]* 38
KGB Chairman Kryuchkov Interviewed *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 44
Former KGB General Kalugin Discusses Speech *[Moscow TV]* 48
Working Group on Control Commissions Meets *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 50
Interethnic Council Chairman Addresses Problems *[Moscow International]* 52
Decree on Draft USSR Labor Law Published *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 53
Draft USSR Law on Labor Disputes, Rights *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 54
Draft Law on Amendments to Labor Law *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 57
Alternative Draft Law on Public Groups Presented *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 59
Corrections to Press Law, Resolution Issued *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 60
Constitutional Compliance Committee Meets 60
  Cites Labor Dispute Law *[TASS]* 60
  Civil Rights Viewed *[TASS]* 60
  'Separation of Powers' Urged *[TASS]* 61
Yakovlev Book on Socialism Reviewed *[NEW TIMES No 24]* 61
Supreme Soviet Ratifies UN Convention *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 63
Committee for Maritime Security Established *[TASS]* 63

Economic

Abalkin Interviewed on Market Economy Transition *[Moscow Radio]* 63

Agricultural

Weather, Crop Conditions Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Jun]* 64

Scientific

Cosmonauts Continue Experiments 26 Jun *[TASS]* 65
Space Engineering To Survey Environment *[Moscow International]* 65

Military

Gorbachev, Yazov at Military Academy Reception 65
  Honor Graduates *[Moscow TV]* 65
  Gorbachev Addresses Graduates *[Moscow Radio]* 66
  Yazov Rebuts 'Concessions' *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 68

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 26 June Supreme Council 72
  Tax Law Debated 72
  Tax Evasion Penalities Urged 72
  Landsbergis Speaks 72
  Landsbergis Continues 73
  Prunskiene Reports 74
Landsbergis Addresses 26 June Supreme Council *[Vilnius Radio]* 74
Lithuanian Parliament Opens Debate on Moratorium *[AFP]* 77
Landsbergis Assesses 'Tension' in Lithuania *[TASS]* 78

Report on Landsbergis, Prunskiene Speeches *[TASS]* 78
Lithuanian Opposition to Moratorium 'Great' *[Moscow TV]* 78
Lithuania, USSR Situation Still 'Unclear' *[Vilnius Radio]* 79
Landsbergis Told Talks Depend on Moratorium *[Moscow TV]* 79
Commentary Views Lithuanian Parliament Debate *[Moscow International]* 79
Lithuanian Military Commissar on Enlistment *[Moscow International]* 80
Estonian Parliament Adopts Immigration Law *[TASS]* 80
Possible Estonian Rights Group Theft Probed *[TASS]* 81
Latvian Supreme Soviet Decides on Party Ties *[TASS]* 81
'Equality' Faction's Opposition Role Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 29 May]* 82
Latvian Pro-Referendum Support Sought *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 29 May]* 83
Diplomatic Historian Discusses 1940 Baltic Events *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 24]* 84

RSFSR

Yeltsin News Conference on Congress Results *[Moscow TV]* 85
Congress Issues Resolution on 'Current Moment' *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 94
Congress Issues Resolution on Farm Loans *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Jun]* 96
Gorbachev Replies to Delegates' Questions *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 96
'Negative Reactions' to Congress Reported *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 105
Institution Group Refuses To Join Russian Party *[Moscow International]* 105
Communists Reportedly Leaving Russian Party *[Moscow TV]* 105
Congress Speech Urges Unifying Role for Party *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Jun]* 105
Gorbachev Interviewed on Russian Party Congress *[Athens RIZOSPASTIS 23 Jun]* 107
Supreme Soviet Official Appointment Reported *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Jun]* 107
New Leningrad City Chairman Elected 18 June *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 108
Sverdlovsk Oblast Chairman Forced To Resign *[TASS]* 108
Outdated Technology, Equipment Cause Poisonings *[Moscow Radio]* 108
Comparison on Russian Party Adopts Appeal *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 109

Western Republics

Report on Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Proceedings *[Kiev International]* 109
  Masol Not Reelected *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jun]* 110
  More on Elections *[TASS]* 110
Report on Fifth Day of Ukrainian Party Congress *[PRAVDA 23 Jun]* 111
Ukraine People's Movement Great Council Meets *[TASS]* 113
Simferopol Issues Statement on Crimean Tatars *[Moscow Radio]* 114
Crimean Tatars To Broadcast in Native Language *[Moscow TV]* 114
'Official Status' Given to 'Odessa Free Town' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Jun]* 114
Redeployment Poses Housing Problems in Belorussia *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Jun]* 115
Belorussian National Democratic Party Founded *[TASS]* 115
Moldavian Communist Party Holds Session *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 10 Jun]* 115
Report on Moldavian 'Declaration of Sovereignty' *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 116

Caucasus

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Begins Debates 26 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 117
  Election Decision Adopted *[TASS]* 117
Azerbaijan's Kafarova Criticizes Armenian Deputies *[Baku Radio]* 118
Transcaucasus Refugees To Receive Compensation *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]* 118
Georgia Adopts Sovereignty, Labor Service Laws *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Jun]* 119
Georgian Popular Front Congress Opens 27 Jun *[TASS]* 120

Central Asia

Kazakh Communist Party Politburo Elected 10 Jun *[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 120
Kazakh Head of State Committee Appointed *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 120
Frunze Official Views Current Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 120
Uzbek, Kirghiz Ministers Meet in Tashkent *[Tashkent Radio]* 121

U.S. Begins Removing Chemical Arms From FRG

LD2606164790 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov]

[Text] Bonn June 26 TASS—The packing of projectiles with toxic agents, which are to be withdrawn from West German territory, began today at the American chemical weapons depot near Pirmasens, Rheinland-Pfalz. In accordance with an agreement reached by Bonn and Washington, all American chemical weapons should be withdrawn from West Germany by the end of the current year. The weapons include 100,000 artillery shells with a total weight of 7,000 tonnes, which are filled with nerve toxic agents.

The packing of chemical weapons into air-tight steel containers and their loading into special vehicles is the first stage of the withdrawal of chemical weapons from West Germany. From July to September the shells will be moved to an American depot in Misau, also in Rheinland-Pfalz. From Misau they will be transported at night by railway to the North Sea port of Nordenham, near Bremerhaven. They will be reloaded there to American ships, which will transport them to the Johnston Atoll to be destroyed.

The West German authorities pay special attention to ensuring the safety of the transportation of chemical weapons. Each transport will be escorted by about one thousand security and police officers.

Washington Exhibits Soviet, U.S. Missiles

PM2606155990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Gan: "'Truly Historic Event' Reportage From Exhibition of Intermediate-Range Missiles"]

[Text] Washington, 20 Jun—Until quite recently they had confronted each other, grayish-green and elegant in their own way. Now they were side by side. Ours was about six or seven meters higher. Its entire casing was covered with strange numerals—A-1, A-2, B-10, L-12, K-13.... Its U.S. neighbor was more straightforward with just one meager cold inscription. They still produce a sense of fear which, thank God, the world did not get to know....

Such an event has never happened before in the annals of Soviet-U.S. relations, nor in international life in general. The two great powers have organized an exhibition of intermediate-range missiles which have now virtually been destroyed under the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. In Washington the title of the exhibition was similar to the Russian proverb "Trust but verify" which former U.S. President R. Reagan took as his slogan. At the U.S. National Air and Space Museum, where the exhibition was held, materials and documents showing how our countries had proceeded, with difficulty but successfully, toward this agreement—the first in human history—were also on display. This was the first such agreement because it stipulated not just the limitation but the destruction of the launchers of nuclear death. The Pershing 2 and our SS-20 quietly standing alongside each other could have destroyed the world but did not do so thanks to the good sense shown by both sides, goodwill and the realization of the absurdity of the suicidal situation whereby the launch of either would have brought human existence to an end.

General C. Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, was unequivocal on this score when he said in response to my question: "I think that this is a truly historic event. I took part in the talks on the treaty as President Reagan's national security adviser. Being here, I can see the real fruits of what we were talking about. For me this exhibition is very important. It shows what our two countries can achieve if they want to get around the negotiating table and discuss their problems. Discuss them directly without cunning, trickery, or attempts to gain unilateral advantage. As you can see on the stand, we have achieved this. The USSR and the United States have started feeling more secure. I hope that the treaty will be a model for our future talks and agreements. Above all, on strategic offensive weapons cuts, joint statements on which were adopted at the recent Soviet-U.S. summit."

Here is the opinion of someone whose name has always been linked with the Soviet-U.S. history of arms control. In conversation with your correspondent, Paul Nitze, head of the U.S. delegation at the talks on the elimination of intermediate-range missiles, said: "For me personally this symbolizes the success of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. Currently we have already destroyed most Pershings and SS-20's. Many people doubted that we would really be able to sign this treaty when both sides had an identical knowledge of its provisions, when they knew what would have to be done and in what way in order to fulfill it, and when monitoring and trust would complement each other. The Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles meets these criteria. And this means that we can have agreements not only on cuts but on destroying whole classes of nuclear weapons. This is shown by the current exhibition. It illustrates very well our countries' potential both from the standpoint of talks and from the standpoint of forthcoming accords. Of course, future talks will be even more complex. But standing here now beside the intermediate-range missiles, we already know that accords can be reached and we can make sure they work."

General Lajoie, leader of the Pentagon's agency for monitoring the destruction of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, made no secret of his satisfaction: "I'm very glad that the sides are cooperating so constructively and positively on this too. The missiles on display in the museum are a graphic example to the whole world of our efforts at cooperation. As we Americans say, it was a good job. For me and for all people this is convincing evidence that both sides could work together and that they could reach agreement at the talks."

...A ceremony was then held. There were speeches. A.A. Bessmertnykh, Soviet ambassador to the United States (who directly participated in the elaboration of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles), spoke. Ceremonially attired Pentagon men took snapshots of each other beside the missiles on the stands. And you thought—are we no longer enemies?

Yazov Urges Warsaw Pact 'Rethinking'

LD2606125190 Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov today called for "rethinking the nature and functions of the Warsaw Treaty" organisation.

Speaking in an interview with the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper, he said this is necessitated by the accelerating disarmament process and the need to create a new pan-European security system.

"We have given up the confrontational attitudes of our previous documents. The changes resulting from Soviet perestroyka and new thinking have not only altered our approaches to the military-political problems of the times, they are altering ourselves," he said.

The Warsaw Pact has set up a commission which is to make proposals concerning the future of the alliance's military wing, including its Joint Chiefs of Staff, by next Autumn, Yazov disclosed.

He regretted the fact that, despite all outward changes for the better in relations between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, "certain forces in the West still maintain that the Soviet Union is an adversary for Western countries".

"On the one hand, our Western partners are satisfied with the Warsaw Treaty being transformed into a political alliance. On the other, they maintain their alliance as a military-political bloc and reserve a central role for it in the future. These things just don't square," Yazov said.

He claimed that the balance of forces is now tipped in NATO's favour. "I am still under the impression that NATO staffs are guided by the desire to disarm the Soviet Union unilaterally," Yazov said.

CEMA's Special Commission Meets in Moscow

LD2706080190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0658 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jun (TASS)—The third session of CEMA's special commission opened in Moscow today. It was formed by decision of the 45th council session in Sofia last January to elaborate proposals for the organization's reform.

Members of the commission, representing all CEMA countries, will continue to draft documents defining ways for radical change of the system of economic cooperation of the 10 countries and also the aims, principles and functions of the council in today's conditions.

Moscow Views Hungarian Claims for Compensation

LD2506095290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 25 Jun 90

[Excerpts] There is to be a meeting in Budapest tomorrow between Jozsef Antall, the country's prime minister, and Colonel General Burlakov, commander of the Southern Group of Forces. Several of the problems that have arisen in connection with the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary will be discussed at this meeting. To some extent, all these problems concern the real estate and property of the Soviet side. Meanwhile, a group of USSR people's deputies has just returned from Hungary where they saw for themselves the state of some of the facilities we are leaving behind us in Hungary—airports, residential houses, barracks, etc. Here is what Vladimir Fadeyev, our Budapest correspondent, has to report on this matter:

[Fadeyev] As the commander of the Southern Group of Forces mentioned in a conversation with the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies and journalists, back in 1987 our government stated its intention of withdrawing its troops from the territory of other states in 1995-97. However, events in East Europe have altered this timetable to some extent, and this has immediately given rise to a number of problems which will take time to resolve, and there is virtually no time. By the end of next June almost 103,000 people are due to return home from Hungary alone. [passage omitted]

We are leaving behind here 165 military townships. Our experts reckon that these facilities are worth 2.8 million foreign currency rubles. Given this, it is clear why the Soviet command wants compensation from the Hungarian side for the facilities being left behind. The Hungarians are saying that they can make their own valuations of all this only after our last soldier leaves. But as the commander says, this principle has already yielded bitter fruit: 16 military townships were left on those conditions last year. But after several months the Hungarian side announced that it would not pay for these since today they look fairly unappealing.

In recent times the Hungarian mass media has been conducting a discussion on the subject of the ecological damage done to those areas where our units were stationed. No actual figures for the damage are cited, but the gist of all the articles on this subject is that the Russians should have to pay for upsetting the ecological balance. What these purely speculative arguments amount to is that all the debate over the cost of the facilities being left behind should eventually result in a zero option: no one would owe anyone anything. Thus, the situation is far from simple, and now the people's deputies will have to have their say on this problem and draw our public's attention to it.

Gerasimov 26 June Briefing on World Issues

On Foreign Debt, Repayments

LD2606140890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1305 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov from the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Jun—Foreign settlements and the USSR's ability to pay were touched upon at a briefing held here today by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Information Department. Referring to figures from Viktor Gerashchenko, chairman of the USSR State Bank, he said that the USSR's debt on current payments was $2 billion.

Speaking in regard to this about the commercial difficulties currently being experienced by the USSR, Gennadiy Gerasimov explained them in terms of "structural reorganization of the Soviet economy, the independent activity on foreign markets of a considerable number of exporters, and a fall in prices". On overcoming these difficulties, he noted that "We are linking this first and foremost with transferring the economy to market conditions."

Having gone on to note that in the intervening period a "definite contribution" to stabilization of the country's financial position "could be made by foreign credits", the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman said: "The credit of 5 billion Deutsche marks given to the USSR by a West German banking consortium is guaranteed by the FRG Government. We are talking here about a financial deal without any kind of political conditions which, in our view, is evidence of confidence in the USSR. Our country's ability to pay is guaranteed by our economic potential."

On Removing Baltic Nuclear Forces

LD2606140190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1325 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov from the USSR Foreign Ministry press center]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Jun (TASS)—Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said today at a briefing that "there is no need for any transfer of Soviet Army units possessing nuclear weapons located on the territory of the USSR." "For that reason", he added, "no unplanned changes are being made to the stationing of those units".

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said this in reply to a question from an Associated Press correspondent about the likelihood of the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the Baltic republics. Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed that he was making this statement on the basis of a report from the press center of the USSR Ministry of Defense.

Urges Solution to Angolan Conflict

LD2606143390 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov urged parties involved in the conflict in Angola to exert every effort to work out the principles of future agreements and a lasting, long-term cease-fire.

Commenting at today's briefing on news media reports about the recent meeting of representatives of Angolan Government and UNITA [Movement for the Total Independence of Angola] regarding the political settlement of the internal conflict in the country, he accused UNITA of frustrating the cease-fire talks.

"Thus a whole year, in which combat operations continued in Angola, was lost which did not promote the solution of mounting socio-economic problems," he said.

"Today when direct, although preliminary contacts, are being established between the Angolan Government and UNITA," the spokesman said, "the Soviet side urges parties to the conflict to exert every effort in order to work out the principles of future agreements, a lasting, long-term cease-fire, to give the process of political settlement a constructive stable nature."

No Israeli Report on Soviet Jews

LD2606144290 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—Responding to a question of the London-based newspaper TIMES about the settlement of Soviet emigrants in Israel, specifically a statement of Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir that he is going to contact President Gorbachev, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a briefing here today that the Soviet side does not have at its disposal "any official letter or report directly from the Israeli Government" on this subject.

"Of course, if the Israeli Government guarantees that Soviet Jews are not settled on occupied territories, this will change the situation, including in our attitude to Israel on the issue of, say, diplomatic relations," he pointed out. However, Gerasimov stressed once again, "it is necessary to see the text". He expressed doubt whether "there are concrete indications there that Soviet emigrants will not be settled in east Jerusalem, which is also an occupied territory".

Denies Kuril Free Trade Zone

LD2606163890 Moscow TASS in English 1557 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov denied a recent report by the Japanese YOMIURI SHIMBUN newspaper, which said, quoting a close Gorbachev aide, that the Soviet Government plans to set up a free economic zone on the four southern Kuril Islands.

Japan claims that the islands belong to it.

YOMIURI SHIMBUN said that the issue will be tackled during President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Tokyo next year.

The Soviet Union is considering setting up free economic zones in different parts of the country, Gerasimov said.

The Soviet Union plans to set up a free economic zone in Nakhodka, and not on the Kuril Islands, he said.

"The link between the setting up of a free economic zone in one of the regions of the Soviet Union with Mikhail Gorbachev's foreign visit is very strange indeed, especially since this is a domestic issue and does not require the agreement of other countries," Gerasimov said.

On Soviet Asia-Pacific Policies

LD2606165990 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—The Soviet Union does not seek for any "rewards" and believes that the mutually advantageous character of international cooperation is the best compensation for its efforts, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing today.

Gerasimov made the statement in order to refute the report published in the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT magazine. The report cited "unnamed leading Western countries' ambassadors in Washington" as saying that during talks between Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, the Soviet president allegedly "recognised the need to return the Kuril Islands to Japan", promised to increase pressure "on the ruling North Korean dynasty" and reduce military presence in Vietnam.

According to the magazine, all this and the meeting with the South Korean president was done in expectation of a "reward", namely large investment agreements with Japan and South Korea.

Gerasimov confirmed that, naturally, regional problems were discussed at the Washington summit. He noted that the sides searched for ways out of conflicts and considerably narrowed the gap between their positions. At the same time, the content of their talks "had nothing to do with the things that the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT magazine wrote", Gerasimov said.

Speaking about Japan's territorial claims to the Soviet Union, Gerasimov said the Soviet official position was again confirmed in Washington and the press wrote about it after the U.S. President informed the Japanese prime minister of his talks with President Gorbachev.

"As for the Soviet-Japanese cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region, the Soviet Union stands for its development and wishes to invigorate Soviet-Japanese relations," Gerasimov said.

In relations with the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, "the Soviet Union intends to stick to the principle of non-interference in internal affairs, develop bilateral relations and support constructive proposals by the Republic's government aimed at lessening tension and normalising the political climate on the Korean peninsula," Gerasimov said.

"Our position on peaceful Korean unification remains stable," he said. "We consider a broad dialogue between the two Korean sides the best way to unification."

The Soviet Union stands for full removal of "all armed forces" from foreign territories and this regards the Soviet armed forces abroad, including in Vietnam, Gerasimov said.

"But the rate of Soviet armed forces reduction in Vietnam will depend on the situation and the other side steps in return to Soviet initiatives aimed at lessening the level of military opposition in the Asia-Pacific region," Gerasimov said.

Notes Reports of Congress Delay

LD2606190190 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—The Soviet Union renders aid to quake victims in Iran, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

Soviet rescuers, doctors and engineers have already been sent there, he said. The Soviet Union sends top priorities and medicines to Iran.

Rouble and currency accounts have been opened at the Soviet Vnesheconombank for donations. The Soviet Foreign Ministry and the Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies hold "operative contacts" with international organisations to coordinate Soviet participation in international aid to Iran, he said.

Gerasimov was asked about rumours that appeared in Moscow today that the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress will be postponed until September. Gerasimov could not confirm or disprove the rumour. "I heard about it but I had no time to obtain more specific information," he said, advising correspondents to address to the congress press centre.

A meeting of the Soviet-Chinese group of diplomatic and military experts was held in Beijing between June 15-26, Gerasimov said. They discussed ways to implement the agreement on the leading principles for mutual reduction of armed forces and confidence building in the military sphere around the Sino-Soviet border. An agreement was reached to continue talks in Moscow in autumn, he said.

Gerasimov informed the briefing of a meeting of Soviet and U.S. historians and politologists near Moscow. They are discussing various aspects and sources of the "cold war" and trying to determine the current stage of the political process.

Gerasimov also spoke of Soviet foreign payments and solvency. The Soviet Union's debt on current payments amounts to two billion U.S. dollars and "foreign credits" could "considerably" help stabilise the country's financial situation, he said.

The West German bank consortium granted to the Soviet Union a credit worth five billion marks which is "guaranteed by the West German government," Gerasimov said. "This is a financial deal without any political pre-conditions and this is an evidence that the Soviet Union enjoys confidence," Gerasimov said.

East Berlin Embassy Views Two-Plus-Four Talks

AU2006135990 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 1100 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Report from East Berlin by correspondent Hans-Juergen Fink, with recorded statement by the new Soviet ambassador to East Berlin, Gennadiy Shikin]

[Text] [Moderator Runge] The day after tomorrow, on Friday [22 June], the foreign ministers' two-plus-four talks will be continued. Old barriers are to be removed and German unity is to be implemented. Despite several extensive talks between FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and his Soviet counterpart Eduard Shevardnadze—the last one took place in Munster in Westphalia on Monday [18 June]—the decisive question of Germany's alliance membership is still open. This morning a background talk took place in the Soviet Embassy in East Berlin. Hans-Juergen Fink in Berlin, you participated in it. What was said about the meeting on Friday?

[Fink] I want to say something beforehand, Mrs. Runge. Gennadiy Shikin is the new Soviet ambassador here in Unter den Linden in East Berlin. He grew up in Leningrad, and there he witnessed the blockade by the German troops during the war. Before that he was in Vienna for four years and now he has arrived in East Berlin. He has been in office for a few weeks.

Thus, the question of how long he will be the ambassador and how long two Soviet Embassies will exist in Germany presented itself. And if there is only one embassy, the question about the capital will arise. Shikin did not want to comment on this in detail. He said that all this is the Germans' affair.

As you already said, the main topic of this talk was the two-plus-four negotiations which will be continued here in East Berlin on Friday. Major differences still exist after the talk between Genscher and Shevardnadze, Shikin said. The central message proclaimed by Shikin was that no pressure should be put on the negotiations.

[Begin Shikin recording] I really want to stress that the two-plus-four negotiations are dealing with a very complicated matter and are indeed of fateful importance for Europe's future. I believe that it is very important that they are taking place in a completely calm and normal atmosphere and are not disturbed or complicated by anything. [end recording]

[Fink] When asked what this means, he said that, objectively speaking, the discussion on the early election date here in Germany is a factor of pressure that could influence the two-plus-four negotiations. Objectively speaking, one must talk of pressure if everything is to be settled, so to speak, in one hour.

In his opinion, one of the main problem of the two-plus-four talks remains the NATO membership of a united Germany. In this respect, Shikin places his hopes in the forthcoming NATO summit in London where, in his opinion, the political structure of the alliance should be set down. The question of the strength of the united German Armed Forces is also important. This is very important so that Germany will become a factor of stability in Europe from which no threat emanates.

He advocated the signing of a joint document which is to put an end to the postwar period, either at the conclusion of the CSCE or at a NATO-Warsaw summit or at the end of the two-plus-four talks. This could also be a peace treaty, but this is not a necessity, Shikin said. It was interesting that he stressed explicitly that the Soviet side will not demand reparations from a united Germany.

[Moderator Runge] Has something been disclosed about a possible link between economic aid for the Soviet Union and its agreement on the question of NATO membership?

[Fink] One cannot say so. There are no conditions or prerequisites, he said. The negotiations must be calmly and carefully conducted without external pressure, conditions, or other demands. This also applies to economic relations, he said. The Soviet side indeed places great hopes in a united Germany and also very concrete hopes, for example, regarding 1 July, considering that Soviet troops will continue to be deployed on GDR territory. Of course, they should not get GDR marks but Deutsche marks. Thus, important economic problems are created in this field.

Of course, other economic questions arise for the Soviet side. The ambassador advocates that after unification, after the monetary reform on 1 July, the contracts must be preserved according to the old Latin saying: pacta sunt servanda. He also advocates that the GDR's commitments to the Soviet Union should be maintained by a united Germany. At present, stocktaking is going on, he said. One must examine which contracts come into consideration. He said that many people in the GDR know the market conditions in the Soviet Union very well. Thus, the prerequisites for favorable economic relations between a united Germany and the Soviet Union are given, he said.

[Runge] Thank you very much, Hans-Juergen Fink in East Berlin.

State Treaty on Unification Called 'Time Bomb'

PM2606081590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by own correspondent: "GDR-FRG: New Beginning"]

[Excerpts] Berlin—The GDR Volkskammer and the FRG Bundestag ratified the state treaty on currency, economic, and social union Thursday 21 June. The overwhelming majority of deputies in both parliaments voted for it. A most important step has been taken toward the unification of the two German states. [passage omitted]

The Volkskammer debates on the state treaty lasted three hours. During the discussion the opposition parties voiced numerous comments and reservations. Deputies from the Party of Democratic Socialism [PDS] and the Union-90/Green coalition said from the rostrum that the treaty did not take sufficient account of the interests of all social groups in the GDR. PDS Chairman Gregor Gysi said that the text of the treaty had been elaborated with virtually no participation by the GDR public at large. In his words, the treaty contains a time bomb because it considers and guarantees the interests of West German businessmen first of all. Social Democrats also criticized the treaty. [passage omitted]

Proposal for Limiting German Armed Forces Viewed

LD2606131890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Jun 90

[Text] THE NEW YORK TIMES reports that the NATO allies are considering a proposal to the Soviet Union to introduce an upper limit of numbers of armed forces of the future united Germany in the first Vienna agreement on limitation of conventional armed forces. In the Latest News commentary Viktor Levin is at the microphone:

[Levin] Discussion on this topic started with the proposal of Shevardnadze, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, at the Berlin meeting of the leaders of the foreign ministries of the six countries in the document put forward by our country—the main principles of a final international legal settlement with Germany—to set a specific, concretely defined upper limit for the size of Germany's armed forces and to envision their restructuring to ensure their inability to conduct offensive actions. This was proposed as one of the elements, but one of the key elements, for establishing guarantees that only peace should emanate from the German territory.

The first reaction of the Western participants of the two-plus-four talks was negative. We, the ministers of foreign affairs of the United States, Britain, and France said, in no measure want to encroach upon the sovereignty of Germany and to decide for it on the issue it should decide itself. The issue of sovereignty, of course, must not be ignored. I think that to look today upon the present generation of Germans as the direct political heirs of the Nazi regime, to blame them for the tragic past and to put forward appropriate demands, would be a profound mistake. The Soviet Union, in putting forward its proposals on establishing a ceiling on the numbers of Germany's armed forces, proceeded from something quite different. Obligations, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze underlined in his speech in Berlin, should be mutual. Furthermore, and we should pay attention to this as well, we are far from the idea of regarding our proposals as the final word. Comrade Shevardnadze called for our proposals to be studied and for other variants to be put forward, and perhaps other approaches as well.

As one can understand from the publications of THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper, the ministers, who I would say were rather hasty to say no, are beginning to think over the Soviet Union's proposal and are seeking variants for solution of the abovementioned problem.

This is gratifying and encouraging. The NATO allies, headed by Bonn, THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, are seriously considering the possiiblity of proposing to Moscow not only promises to examine in general terms the size of the German Army, but also to point out a specific limit which will be put into force within the framework of a subsequent agreement. They are also giving a specific figure to the limit: about 350,000 men.

I do not know how the question will be resolved, or on what all the sides will agree. But the very fact that the Soviet proposal is being given serious consideration bears witness to the fact that the active and constructive nature of our country's foreign policy, a policy proceeding from the tasks of strengthening the USSR's security, is yielding results. I do not wish to say that Soviet people's legitimate concern over the unification of the two German states has already been removed. But the fact that that concern is being removed, that in the event of a mutually acceptable agreement being worked out it will be removed, can and must be stated.

Results of German Unification Talks 'Contradictory'

LD2506172990 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 25 Jun 90

[By TASS political analyst Aleksandr Antsiferov]

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS—The results of the second meeting of foreign ministers within the framework of the two-plus-four mechanism are contradictory.

The sides have found and confirmed a basis for the future compromise on the external aspects of German unity—the World War II victors and the two Germanies have agreed that there must be no infringement on the sovereignty of or a discrimination against a united Germany—a very promising sign.

However, it simultaneously turned out that the negotiators have differing ideas about how this consensus should be implemented.

The United States, according to Secretary of State James Baker, seeks an early end to the rights and obligations of the four World War II victors in Germany in order to remove the last obstacles to German sovereignty.

During the Berlin meeting James Baker, however, rejected a Soviet proposal to reduce the troops of the victors in East Germany and West Germany to symbolic levels or completely withdraw them from Germany.

He also rejected the idea to withdraw allied forces from greater Berlin within six months after the creation of a united Germany's government and parliament.

Baker's attempts to explain his point of view by claiming that the implementation of Soviet initiatives is dangerous, since it "can sow the seeds of instability in Europe," are not convincing.

An analysis of this point of view shows that it was prompted by a desire to succeed in including a united Germany into NATO, without giving any security guarantees to the Soviet Union.

It is true, that NATO foreign ministers announced at the Alliance's last session in Scotland that they will seek to "politicize" NATO. However, NATO European Commander General John Galvin said in an interview with THE STANDARD newspaper on Sunday that a united Germany, and he has no doubts that a united Germany will become a NATO member, will adhere to NATO policies, including the nuclear deterrent doctrine, and that it will support the idea of deploying nuclear weapons on its territory.

If the general's statements reflect genuine NATO plans, then how will Western political leaders, as they have repeatedly said, "convince the Soviet Union that German membership in NATO is in its own interests"?

In this connection, East German Prime Minister Lothar de Maziere's appeal to the West, voiced in an interview with the London's FINANCIAL TIMES, not to abuse the policy of strength at the two-plus-four talks, is very timely.

The West's disrespect to the Soviet leadership's views on the German issue is unacceptable for the Soviet people both politically and psychologically, he said.

"I do not think this will be in the interest of a united Germany," the prime minister said.

Nor will this be in the interest of the entire Europe.

Shevardnadze Proposes German 'Transition Period'

AU2706094190 Paris AFP in English 0931 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] Berlin, June 27 (AFP)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said Wednesday that Moscow was prepared to compromise on the "transition period" which it insists should precede full German reunification, the former East German Communist Party daily NEUES DEUTSCHLAND reported.

Mr. Shevardnadze rejected the idea of "special treatment for Germany" in the arrangements for reunification now being negotiated among the two German states and the four victorious World War II Allies. The Soviet foreign minister said "a certain period of transition" was "necessary" before full German reunification. But he said the text he submitted last Friday to the so-called "two-plus-four" talks and which called for a five-year transitional period was "not our last word". He said the text was "a project and we are ready to compromise and consider other options".

The West has opposed the idea of an extended transition period for German reunification.

Mr. Shevardnadze said much depended on how the NATO alliance of Western nations reacted to the reforms currently under way in East Europe, and that he was awaiting the outcome of the NATO summit next month in London.

Soviet Delegate on Copenhagen CSCE Conference

PM2606132990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Interview with Yu.A. Reshetov, Soviet delegation head at the second CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension in Copenhagen, by special correspondent A. Lopukhin under the "Our Interviews" rubric, datelined Copenhagen, June: "Human Dimension: Aspects and Opinions"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Debates in Copenhagen at the second CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension, the participants in which have already gone halfway toward their goal, are continuing in a constructive fashion without mutual sermonizing. PRAVDA's special correspondent put several questions regarding the progress of the conference to Yu.A. Reshetov, Soviet delegation head at this all-European forum.

[Reshetov] The main efforts of the delegations from the 33 European countries, the United States, and Canada are currently focused on the four working commissions preparing the conference's final documents. The Soviet delegation holds constructive approaches on all the main problems under discussion there: We advocate the creation of a unified legal space in Europe; we favor granting national minorities more rights without, of course, upsetting stability anywhere; broadening humanitarian confidence-building measures; and lastly, gradually abolishing the death penalty and ensuring regular contacts between people and the basic freedoms of the individual.

[Lopukhin] How topical are the problems being discussed in Copenhagen today for safeguarding the vital interests of the peoples of Europe?

[Reshetov] Let us consider just one aspect which is typical of the significant changes on our continent. The democratization process has been mobilized in Europe today. The sentiments and will of the broad popular masses increasingly determine the nature of the development of internal political and international events. At the same time we are having to deal with explosive situations which pose a threat to positive processes on our continent. I would above all cite the threatening growth of nationalism, outbreaks of which can now be seen everywhere.. This obviously stems from the fact that many pressing problems were either hushed up or not resolved for a long time in a number of countries. The democratization process which has become part of everyday life is, unfortunately, now accompanied by intolerance toward others' views and by attempts to resolve painful issues, which have built up over the decades, through pressure and sometimes force. For instance, despite the obvious will of the peoples, minority groups in various countries who were not effectively given a vote of confidence during national elections are trying to take revenge via "mob democracy," as happened quite recently in Romania.

[Lopukhin] International human rights forums have always been the scene of tough clashes. The situation has presumably changed radically now. But recurrences of the past have probably not disappeared once and for all?

[Reshetov] Double standards are, regrettably, still making themselves felt in politics. Thus, any objective observer in Copenhagen cannot help but be struck by the following fact. During the meeting a whole series of official delegations have congratulated the Czechoslovak representatives on holding democratic elections in their country. At the same time some Western participants in the conference "forgot" to congratulate the Bulgarian delegation on their equally democratic elections. After all, virtually all the delegations gathered here support the idea that democratic elections are effectively the basis of progressive transformations in any country. We should certainly "take our hats off" to elections of this kind, whatever their outcome. The confrontational approach in the human rights sphere seemed to have been laid to rest, but this cannot all be said to be a thing of the past once and for all.

[Lopukhin] The actual development of events in the world promotes the realization that no one possesses the supreme truth, notably in the humanitarian-legal sphere. Is this realization producing any specific results?

[Reshetov] The Soviet delegation has been reassured in this respect by, for instance, the statement made by S. Hoyer, chairman of the U.S. Senate Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, at the conference. He spoke of democratic changes in Europe, pointed out the Soviet and U.S. achievements in this sphere, and also frankly shared his experience of combating some evils common to all mankind, primarily manifestations of racism on American soil. The Canadian and French delegations demonstrated the same self-critical and constructive approach. Naturally, we provide objective information about what is happening in our country. This mutual exchange enables us to get away from the practice of scoring points off one another and to move onto analyzing the experience of those countries that have succeeded in resolving various problems at home in a more sensible fashion.

None of the 35 states involved in the Helsinki process—and Albania has effectively joined them—are immune to dangerously explosive situations. In this connection, I think that the Copenhagen forum will ultimately help Europeans find new forms of solving various conflicts, of which there are a considerable number both in the Old World and in the United States and Canada. That is why it is not only governments but also, as they say in the West, the "man in the street" who are inspired with hope for a better future by the development of the Helsinki processes and who are strengthened in their belief in the irreversibility of the democratic processes in Europe and that these processes will not undermine the stable foundations of European civilization.

[Lopukhin] In addition to official delegations, various nongovernmental organizations—national and international—are engaged in active work at the Copenhagen conference. How can we assess the significance of their parallel events?

[Reshetov] First, their involvement in the Copenhagen forum helps us to take a more realistic view of all the urgent problems under discussion here. The parallel debates verify the correctness of the subjects we have chosen and supplement our work. For instance, the official delegations have somewhat shunned questions like the rights of young people and women. The representatives of nongovernmental organizations reminded diplomats in an extremely impartial manner of the need to resolve these issues within the framework of the Helsinki process.

Foreign Policy Aides View Future of NATO

PM2606151490 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 22 Jun 90 p 9

[Dispatch by Bjarne Stenquist: "NATO Has a Role in All of Europe"]

[Text] Moscow—The Soviet Union is moving toward changing its attitude to NATO. From being depicted as a tool of imperialist expansion, a more political NATO is now being described increasingly often as a guarantee of democracy and stability in Europe.

Throughout Europe a discussion is taking place about what the new security order will look like after the liberation of East Europe from Soviet domination. The Soviet line has long been that both military alliances—NATO and the Warsaw Pact—should be dissolved and be replaced by new pan-European cooperation within the framework of the CSCE. A similar view has prevailed at the Swedish Foreign Ministry.

But the further developments have moved since the dramatic fall of 1989, the more life's realities have forced changes in this vision. The most important thing to have emerged is that NATO and the Warsaw Pact cannot be put on an equal footing. NATO was created as a result of voluntary cooperation between 16 democratic and affluent industrial nations. The Warsaw Pact came into being as a result of a Soviet policy of diktat over six economically weak single-party states.

Now that this Soviet straitjacket has been relaxed most of these states want to be rid of Soviet troops and Soviet influence.

NATO too is having problems in adapting to the new situation. But its cohesion is still strong, and it is pure wishful thinking to believe that the alliance will dissolve itself. On the contrary, it has a decisive influence on the disarmament negotiations in Vienna and is exerting a growing attraction on countries such as Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

In Moscow this has given rise to a changed view of NATO which varies from enthusiastic support to a cooler noting of the facts.

One of the positive NATO supporters is Professor Sergey Blagovolin at the World Economics and International Relations Institute:

"The situation in Europe is that the future of the Warsaw Pact seems very uncertain and that the CSCE still has no firm character. NATO is the only functioning and vital security structure that exists here and now. Weakening it or dissolving it would not promote the stability of Europe," Prof. Blagovolin said.

He gave several reasons for this:

—NATO is not a military threat, either to the Soviet Union or to East Europe. The organization has a purely defensive thrust.

—Within NATO people have long experience of integrating and commanding military forces from several countries, some of which are former archenemies. This multinational control over military units contains valuable lessons for the countries of East Europe, where national antagonisms are again on the increase.

—NATO is the organization which can best control the military forces of a united Germany. Germany's membership of NATO and the EC is crucial to the country's integration in Europe.

—NATO has a unique role as a bridge between Europe and the United States and Canada. A continued U.S. interest in Europe is important for the maintenance of peace and stability.

—In the future the whole of Europe will face new military threats from countries which have acquired nuclear arms, chemical weapons, and long-range missiles. Some form of collective military organization will be needed to meet these threats.

"The future inside and outside Europe will be no rose-strewn path to eternal peace," Sergey Blagovolin said.

His colleague, Vladimir Baranovskiy, head of the West European department at the World Economics and International relations Institute, is less enthusiastic.

"I consider that NATO has a role to play in the Europe of the future. But we have to realize that the organization was created to counter militarily a threat from the Soviet Union. Now that this threat is disappearing, NATO is having problems in explaining its own existence to the Western European public. Whether the alliance can handle its own demilitarization is an open question.

"You also have to realize that future threats will not be primarily military. They will have to do with ethnic and national antagonisms, environmental destruction, and economic injustices. What can NATO do in these fields?" Vladimir Baranovskiy asked.

"That is why there will probably be some sort of division of labor im the future between NATO, the EC, CSCE, and the Council of Europe."

At the Soviet Foreign Ministry there is a clearly realistic view of NATO.

"NATO today is one of Europe's best functioning organizations, held together by strong countries. We should not count on its swift dissolution. In the future it will be also necessary to use existing organizations such as NATO, the EC, and so on," said Andrey Kozyrev, head of the Foreign Ministry's department for international organizations.

But he also issued a warning:

"If the Warsaw Pact does disappear, there could be a dangerous situation if the Soviet Union feels that it is meeting a strong military bloc on its own. If, on the other hand, NATO can be transformed from a military organization into a federation to support democracy and stability in Europe, then we are moving in the same direction," Kozyrev said.

Andrey Grachev, deputy head of the Central Committee's International Department, was the person interviewed by DAGENS NYHETER who expressed the most ideological view of NATO and called the organization a "war machine," for example. But even he was prepared to grant NATO an important role in the Europe of the future.

"There are significant gaps in a new European security order which could be filled by NATO or at least by certain parts of today's NATO. The CSCE and a NATO ready for political cooperation with the Warsaw Pact are all the building blocks of a future Europe," Andrey Grachev said.

There is another important reason why NATO will continue to exist for a considerable time. In the West, as well as the East, the increasing fragmentation of the Soviet Union is recognized as the greatest uncertainty factor in the development of Europe.

"The greatest danger in the future is civil war in the Soviet Union which is packed with both nuclear and conventional arms. I fully understand that in such a situation NATO is unwilling to run down its military cooperation," a Soviet observer told DAGENS NYHETER.

United States & Canada

General Powell Favors 'Cautious' Military Cuts

PM2606141390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Pentagon's Stance"]

[Text] Washington, 23 Jun—U.S. policy must take into consideration the changes occurring in the world, while at the same time its defense requirements must be ensured. General C. Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, said this in a speech to the National Press Club.

Although we applaud the changes in the Soviet Union and hope for a further reduction in the threat, he stressed, we must pursue our military planning with consideration for a changing rather than a changed world. "We must make ourselves secure for all possible developments of events in the future," the general said, favoring a cautious approach to reductions in U.S. military spending since a sharp reduction in military spending could, in his view, "undermine the foundation of the U.S. Armed Forces." The chairman of the Joint Chiefs spoke of the need to strengthen U.S. strategic nuclear forces to ensure that they "are second to none." He also advocated continued implementation of the SDI program.

"At the same time," Powell pointed out, "we must make progress at the strategic arms talks in order to limit the growth and reduce the number of nuclear arms and switch the emphasis in the U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenals to less destabilizing, less threatening systems. The strategic nuclear arms treaty under preparation represents progress in precisely this direction. It is quite obviously in our interests, and both I and the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a whole fully support it."

Primakov Meets With U.S. Political Scientists

LD2606205990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today, Comrade Primakov met prominent political scientists of the USSR and the United States who are taking part in a Soviet-U.S. symposium devoted to investigating the origins of the cold war. [video shows Primakov talking to several other men and one woman around a table]

Various aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations, the present international situation as a whole, and topical issues in the USSR's domestic politics were touched on during the conversation. Comrade Primakov answered numerous questions from those attending the meeting.

Soviet Trade Officials Assess U.S. Talks

OW2306203690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Video interview by commentator Vladimir Pozner with Ernest Yevgenyevich Obminskiy, Soviet deputy foreign minister, and Yuriy Nikolayevich Chumakov, deputy minister of the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, at the Vista Hotel in Washington, DC; from the "120 Minutes" program—recorded]

[Text] [Pozner] Ernest Yevgenyevich Obminskiy, you are responsible for the entire portfolio of trade and economic relations with the United States. Yuriy Nikolayevich Chumakov, your area is specifically trade relations and trade agreements. [Pozner nods to Obminskiy] I would like to ask you the first question, namely, how would you characterize what has been accomplished in your area during these negotiations?

[Obminskiy] Well, first of all, I would like to say that in essence, the economic sphere has remained perhaps the last, untouched iceberg of the cold war in Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Pozner, interrupting] And has it now melted?

[Obminskiy] Let me put it this way: It has begun to thaw considerably. Less than a year ago, there were essentially no discussions, no agreements, no economic accords. There were the usual debates on arms reductions, but even then it was clear that it is important not only to lay aside weapons but also to extend a hand to one another. That turned out to be considerably more difficult.

[Pozner] Is that unexpected?

[Obminskiy] Yes, because traditionally there prevailed in the policies of the stronger economic partner a desire... [Obminskiy changes thought] and the opinion existed that economics is the most convenient tool for affecting (?politics), for influencing it.

[Pozner] But that view no longer exists?

[Obminskiy] There is the opposing view. This has been made very clear in Washington these days. Among many government officials, and particularly in the media, there has been a temptation to confuse politics and economics, that is, to make certain demands at the last minute, to try for the sake of temporary gain to sacrifice such a difficult and time-consuming package of economic agreements.

Nevertheless, I have to say that in this case, reason prevailed in the government. Its approach to the most important goals turned out to be more reasonable than we could have expected, and, in the end, important, unprecedented economic agreements were signed, such as a trade agreement, an agreement on air travel between the USSR and the United States, on shipping, and an agreement on grain. Also during the visit, agreements were reached and letters of intent were signed within business circles and with representatives of the sciences and education in the United States....

[Pozner, interrupting] Okay, I am going to interrupt you. That is what was signed. All the same, an agreement was not reached on granting the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status.

[Pozner, turning to Chumakov] And I would like to ask you, Yuriy Nikolayevich: To what extent do we in our country need this status?

[Chumakov] First of all, I would like to say that until now, the United States has been perhaps the only developed capitalist country with which the Soviet Union has diplomatic relations but not most-favored-nation status. Most-favored-nation status is actually a very common principle which guarantees equal, mutually beneficial foreign economic ties between two countries.

What does it provide in practical terms? Well, it allows us to import foodstuffs, which we buy from the United States in considerable quantities. We now buy grain and we have begun buying butter and cream. We buy vegetable oil and meat. We can also buy consumer goods and a whole range of things. This principle would give us better access to the American market. The duties currently levied on our goods imported into the United States would be reduced by eight times. That would allow us to both place more goods on the market and to receive more.

[Pozner] But to my knowledge most-favored-nation status—and please correct me if I am wrong—basically gives you the right to export to the United States under normal tariffs, and if you do not have this status, there is a barrier which makes exporting very difficult. So my question is: What, in fact, can we now export to the United States?

[Chumakov] Well, we now export quite a few things, primarily raw materials, and even if we continued to export the same amount, we would earn more money. There is a second issue. Until now, the American market has not been economically profitable for our exports. That is due to the long distance, the freight costs, and to these duties as well. They essentially closed the American market to a great many Soviet goods. With the granting of this principle, the American market will become more accessible.

[Pozner] But it seems to me that there is also a purely political aspect; that today this is important politically, but as far as trade ties are concerned, it will be more important in the future.

[Chumakov] You are absolutely correct, because aside from the [words indistinct] which I mentioned, the absence of most-favored-nation status creates an unfavorable (?situation) for all concerned. For example, no prominent businessman will put money into the Soviet economy if he does not know what tomorrow will bring. Therefore, both for our businesses and for American businesses, the mutual granting of this principle would blaze a very broad trail in our relations.

[Pozner] I have another question. This will be the last one, and I will address it to you both. What do all of these trade and economic agreements provide for the average Soviet citizen? How will an ordinary person feel the result? So much is said and so much is written, but really....[Pozner changes thought] And if he will feel it, when? [Pozner, turning to Obminskiy] Please.

[Obminskiy] I think he will feel some things rather quickly, but some things will lag....

[Pozner, interrupting] Well tell us about the quick ones, please.

[Obminskiy] The quick ones, everything so fast....

[Pozner] Well we have been patient for a long time.

[Obminskiy] To be quick, I will say this. Our civil aviation, and that of the Americans, currently transports 130,000 air travellers per year [as heard]. That number, if the agreement is implemented and everything goes according to plan, will increase to 500,000 passengers per year. You yourself see what goes on in our airports. What will things look like then? In addition, a whole series of new airports will be opened both in the United States and in the Soviet Union.

[Pozner] Okay, what else besides that?

[Obminskiy] Besides that. Well, if we are talking about civil aviation, that has a direct impact on people. They will not have to stand in line. Next, I will mention navigation. The agreement on navigation gives our ships easier access, and it gives American ships easier access to us; that is, it is now simpler for us to enter American ports, and it will also be much simpler for the Americans to come to us. We, by the same token... [changes thought] That is, that creates the possibility first of all to significantly reduce transport costs. Second, we will now be transporting cargo to third countries. Until now, we could not conduct trade between the United States... [changes thought] We can conduct trade on our ships between American ports and the ports of third countries.

[Pozner, turning to Chumakov] Okay, I am going to ask you—I know it is a most difficult question—but nevertheless: When I go into a store, in my day-to-day life, will I see some sort of result? Or just come right out and say that we will not see results yet, so that people understand.

[Chumakov] I should say that even now the Soviet citizen is getting a pretty good sense of what we are doing in the area of trade. For example, last year we bought almost 23 million tons of grain here, a significant proportion of which went toward supplying the population with food and part of which was used as animal feed to produce meat.

[Pozner] But that was in the past.

[Chumakov] That was in the past. Now, I already said that in order to buy more we must first of all sell more. I already answered that question, that that opportunity is presenting itself. Moreover, we have great intellectual potential. This agreement creates the opportunity to share the fruits of our intellectual endeavors and to earn money in the process. Third, this agreement opens the path toward financing American exports to the Soviet Union. Until now, these issues of credit had not been resolved. American companies can now invest their resources in developing production, including the production of consumer goods, the production of technology, which we need very badly, and so on. We can share our experiences. In just a few days, a conference devoted to agricultural cooperation, food production, and so on, will open here. This agreement creates the basis for bringing all of these ties to fruition and for achieving concrete results for the Soviet people.

[Obminskiy] To sum everything up in one phrase, I would like to say that, to a great extent, we will now be open to American capital, to American goods, and to American trade, and by the same token the American market will be open to us. But the American market is an exceptionally competitive market and deeply diversified, and therefore it is perhaps an additional stimulus and an additional argument for us to abandon even more quickly our inertia and to achieve efficiency in our production, precisely because unprecedented opportunities are opening up for our exports. And activity (aktivnost) will of course greatly further that.

[Chumakov] I would like to support Comrade Obminskiy in the sense that the market is huge and complex, and in order to receive more you have to sell more. We should not miss that opportunity, because in my opinion that is the most important thing we will receive—the chance to earn money.

[Pozner] We will try to sell more. Thank you and best wishes.

U.S., Soviet Historians Discuss Cold War

LD2506115690 Moscow TASS in English 1111 GMT 25 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Skripnikov]

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS—Soviet and U.S. historians and politicians met today at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Meshcherino Mansion near Moscow to discuss the origins of the cold war.

The three-day seminar was organised with the assistance of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Research Centre and the U.S. Institute for Peace.

Today, History Professors Richard Pipes of Harvard University and John Gaddis of Ohio University, Professor of Political Economy Waltom Rostow of Texas and Soviet historians from the Academy of Sciences' Institute of Universal History will discuss Soviet-U.S. relations between 1917-1945, the postwar settlement and the Yalta and Potsdam diplomacy, and Soviet and U.S. historiography at the beginning of the cold war.

Vadim Shustov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Research Centre, told TASS that the seminar would help establish the "historical truth about the origins of the policy of confrontation, which determined the relations between the two countries throughout the postwar decades".

Health Care Protocol Signed With U.S.

LD2106084290 Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 21 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Alexey Berezhkov]

[Text] Washington June 21 TASS—The tenth session of the Soviet-American commission for cooperation in health care ended in the U.S. capital on Wednesday with the signing of a protocol on the results of the session.

Participants in the session referred to the session results as a breakthrough towards achieving the main goal: to ensure the health and well-being of the two countries' people.

The importance of the protocol is determined by the fact that this is virutally the first major inter-governmental document after the Washington summit, James Mason, assistant to the U.S. secretary of health and human services and chairman of the American side of the joint commission, told TASS.

"The talks were notable for an unprecedented degree of openness and readiness to understand each other's needs and desire to work together as never before in 18 years of the existence of the inter-governmental agreement on cooperation in medical science and health care," he said.

"We stated a desire to work together in such areas as mother-and-child welfare and the fight against viral diseases, including AIDS.

"Our two countries have gained wide experience in these areas. No one intends to copy the health care systems of the other but we can derive much benefit by drawing on each other's experience," Mason said.

Apart from ten cooperation projects, the two countries' delegations agreed to develop contacts in new fields, including joint efforts to resolve problems associated with the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident.

"It has now been decided to set up an international centre in our country to study the radiological consequences of the breakdown at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. The centre will operate under the auspices of the World Health Organisation. We agreed that U.S. scientists will participate in this work most actively," Soviet Health Minister Igor Denisov told TASS.

"I think the first laboratories of this centre will open this year," he added.

"We also agreed to cooperate in the field of the provision of our country with medicines," Denisov said. "These efforts presuppose close contacts between Soviet and American scientists and specialists, from the development of medicinal preparations to their registration and the establishment of joint ventures for their commercial production.

"Yet another important area is to develop the genome of the smallpox virus by means of gene engineering in order to destroy the virus.

"On the whole a major step was made during the tenth session of the joint commission toward qualitative development of cooperation between the two countries in health care," Denisov said.

China

Li Peng, Gorbachev April Meeting Reported On

LD2706094390 Moscow TASS in English 0922 GMT 27 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Tomilin]

[Text] Beijing June 27 TASS—Chinese Premier Li Peng's visit to the Soviet Union in April was a major event deepening Sino-Soviet relations on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence, Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen reported to the current session of the standing committee of the Chinese National People's Congress.

During the talks beteen Li Peng, President Mikhail Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders, the report says, mutual satisfaction was expressed with the development of bilateral relations, and readiness was expressed to adhere to the spirit of the Sino-Soviet joint communique published in May last year.

The sides expressed hope for the actual expansion of exchanges and cooperation between the two countries on a stable basis. The need was stressed to observe in bilateral relations the principle of non-intervention into each other's internal affairs and respect for the people's own choice.

Differences in views on some points, the report says, will not affect the development of normal relations beween the two countries.

The visit, the Chinese minister stressed, speeded the conclusion of a Sino-Soviet agreement on the guiding principles of mutual armed force reductions along the Soviet-Chinese border and on confidence-building measures in the military field.

The first agreement on arms reduction in the Asian-Pacific region, it promotes the development of good-neighbourly relations, friendship and trust between the two great powers and has a great importance for strengthening peace and security in Far East and Asian-Pacific region.

PRC Supervision Minister Visits Soviet Union

OW2706085490 Moscow International Service in Mandarn 0200 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Passages within quotation marks are recorded]

[Text] A delegation from the Chinese Ministry of Supervision, headed by Minister Wei Jianxing, recently visited the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Committee of People's Control. Our station's reporter (Sorokin) has the following report on this:

The visit by the delegation from the Chinese Ministry of Supervision was one to reciprocate last year's visit to China made by the delegation of the Soviet Committee of People's Control led by Kolbin, chairman of the committee. As planned, the Chinese delegation visited the Ukraine and Leningrad and held talks in Moscow. At the numerous central-level and local meetings, the two sides extensively exchanged views on the subject of strengthening supervisory work under the condition of conducting economic reform.

On Monday Minister Wei Jianxing and Chairman Kolbin signed a document on the establishment of constant contacts between the counterpart departments of the two countries. In a brief interview following the document-signing ceremony, Minister Wei Jianxing gave the following comments on the result of this visit:

"Our comrades believe that we have successfully fulfilled the purpose of this visit. Our visit to the Soviet Union is aimed at enhancing mutual understanding and friendship between the two sides so as to create a favorable condition for the development of cooperation in the future. More importantly, however, we wish to learn from the Soviet Union's experience through this visit. Since the central task of our party and state at present is still economic construction, the work of supervision must be centered around economic construction. For this reason, the supervisory organ should gradually strengthen supervision over economic work, either on the basis of the needs at present or from a long-term point of view. This is where we have inadequate experience, while the Soviet Union has rich experience in this respect."

In reply to a question about the complexity of the work of supervisory departments, Chinese Minister of Supervision Wei Jianxing said:

"The main task of the supervisory organ is to exercise supervision and combat corruption. Under the present historical conditions, however, it is often very hard to investigate and deal with cases of corruption. For instance, an individual receives bribe. Bribery involves only two people. You gave the money to me, I received the money, and no third person was involved. It is rather difficult to do investigative work to expose such problems. This is particularly true when the case involves economic contacts with foreign countries."

Before the end of the interview, the reporter asked Minister Wei Jianxing: How do you view the criticism that people make against the department of supervision? He replied:

"Cadres of the department of supervision should be mentally prepared for such criticism. Their work is to investigate people and take action against them. So they are apt to offend people and are, therefore, often blamed and criticized by the people. This is one of the characteristics of the professional work of the department of supervision. We are well prepared mentally for this."

Chinese, Vietnamese Relations Seen Improving

OW2506223790 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 16 Jun 90

[(Mikhakinov) commentary from the "World Today" program]

[Text] Xu Dunxin, assistant minister of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, has concluded his visit to Vietnam. He held an informal talk with Vietnamese Vice Foreign Minister Tran Quang Ci. Station observer (Mikhakinov) writes:

Although the reason for the visit was quite simple—to inspect the Chinese Embassy's work in Hanoi—reporters consider the visit of great significance. Many people have said this visit is another step leading to the normalization of Sino-Vietnamese relations. Indeed, Xu Dunxin is the highest ranking Chinese representative to visit Vietnam since 1979.

In 1979, the worsening relations between the two neighbors and the armed conflicts in the border area essentially froze the relations between the two countries. The situation over the past 10 years has shown that confrontation is not good for people on either side. What is worse, the tense relations between China and Vietnam have had a bad influence on the situation in that region. It is necessary to improve the relations now that advantageous conditions are available: The relations between the Soviet Union and China are completely normalized, and Vietnam has pulled its troops out of Cambodia.

The people of the two socialist neighbors have fine traditions of friendship and cooperation as well as common long-range interests. Both China's policy and Vietnam's renovation are for the purpose of perfecting socialism and tapping its potential in an all-round way. The relations between China and Vietnam recently started to improve. Life in the border area is becoming more and more peaceful every day, and border trade is developing. Diplomatically, the two countries are also developing. For instance, the vice foreign ministers of the two countries last year held a consultative meeting which brought the stands on the Cambodia issue closer. Not long ago, Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam, for the first time received Chinese Ambassador to Vietnam Zhang Dewei. Both sides expressed wishes to restore their traditional friendship and normalize the relations of the two countries as soon as possible for the fundamental, long-range interests of the people of the two countries and for consolidating peace and stability in Southeast Asia and the whole world.

Xu Denxin's visit to Hanoi shows that the two sides have differences on the Cambodia issue. These differences should be solved through talks. The two countries not only are responsible for the relations between them, but also shoulder greater responsibility for the peace, stability, security, and cooperation in the region.

Chunhawan Urges China on Cambodia Issue

OW2106142490 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan said: The prospects for peace in the land of Cambodia are becoming more and more obvious day after day. However, the Khmer Rouge still remains the major obstacle to the peaceful mediation of the years-long conflict.

Chunhawan told a Thailand broadcasting station reporter after meeting with President Bush that China should stop supporting the Khmer Rouge clique.

The Thai prime minister called on the United States and Japan to influence China on the issue of stopping the supply of weapons to Pol Pot elements.

Chatchai is one of those who have played a key role in mediating in the Cambodian conflict in recent years. He proposed the second informal meeting in Jakarta and the recent meeting between Cambodian Premier Hun Sen and Prince Sihanouk, leader of the resistance forces. He also poroposed that the battlefield of Southeast Asia be turned into a trade and cooperation zone.

PRC Trade Exhibition Opens in Moscow 22 Jun

PM2606134190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[V. Mkrtchyan report: "At 'PRC-90' Exhibition"]

[Text] When you enter the trade and economic pavilion of the PRC-90 exhibition, which opened at the Exhibition Complex in Krasnaya Presnya 22 June, you are struck by the variety and vividness of the exhibits. They are not just the traditional wares which China has exported to the USSR before: textiles, leather fancy goods, crockery, and other consumer goods. This time there is a variety of new types of modern equipment and technology. They all attest to the PRC's achievements in recent years.

"The aim in organizing this exhibition," exhibition director Xie Jiangchun said at a press conference, "is the further strengthening of friendship between our peoples and the uninterrupted expansion of trade and economic cooperation between the PRC and the Soviet Union."

The participants in the exhibition with whom I spoke stressed that Chinese enterprises are interested not only in exporting their own goods to the USSR. They are also interested in developing relations in the sphere of technical and economic cooperation with Soviet partners, including the creation of joint ventures, the provision of services, and the exchange of scientific and technical information and technology.

The USSR will reciprocate with a trade and industrial exhibition in Beijing in September this year.

USSR-PRC Diplomatic, Military Experts Meet

OW2706081890 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Soviet and Chinese groups of diplomatic and military experts held a meeting from 15 to 26 June in Beijing. The two sides discussed questions concerning the reduction of armed forces along the border as well as the measures and the guiding principle for strengthening mutual trust in the military field. After consultations, it was agreed that the two sides will hold talks on these questions in the fall of 1990 in Moscow.

Northeast Asia

New Japanese Envoy to Moscow Interviewed

OW2406042790 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 21 Jun 90

[Interview with Japanese Ambassador to Soviet Union Sumio Edamura by an unidentified Moscow Radio reporter; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] Ten days have passed since Sumio Edamura, who was appointed Japanese ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Soviet Union, arrived in the Soviet Union. Ambassador Edamura, who has yet to complete the presentation of credentials, has granted an interview to a Moscow Radio reporter. The following are questions and answers in the interview.

[Reporter] In an interview with an IZVESTIYA reporter prior to your departure for Moscow, you said that current Japanese-Soviet relations are not fully responding to the potential of Japan and the Soviet Union. Could you give more details on this view?

[Edamura] I have talked with ranking officials of the Soviet Government since I came here. At the talks, they said that Japan and the Soviet Union are nations which can be called powers, or superpowers, and despite the fact that the two countries are neighbors, their relations still are not in good shape. For example, Japan's trade volume with the Soviet Union accounts for from one to 1.5 percent of Japan's total foreign trade volume. This trade volume between the two countries is too small in view of the fact that the Soviet Union is a big nation and Japan's neighbor. Everyone agrees with this view. However, the trade between the two countries can be expanded if they make efforts. I think that there are various problems.

I talked with some Japanese interested in the Soviet Union before I came here. In particular, I talked with business leaders on various issues. At the talks, they told me that they feel the need to deepen economic relations with the Soviet Union and intend to do so. However, they pointed out some obstacles and difficulties. For one thing, the economic reform presently under way in the Soviet Union is very desirable from a long prospect. However, the central government has thus far had full authority; this has made it clear as to which organizations are responsible.

As decentralization of authority progresses and state-run enterprises or cooperatives are granted autonomy, authority is being decentralized; this is making it unclear as to which organizations are responsible in the course of implementing the decentralization. Although I believe that this is a transitional phenomenon, many Japanese business leaders pointed this out. Japanese businessmen engaged in trade with the Soviet Union are concerned about this. I believe that this has resulted in the Soviet Union deferring payment to Japan, which has become an issue.

Many business leaders pointed out concern over what would become of the ruble. Although I have been here for just 10 days, I do not know the value of the ruble well. There are varying values as evidenced by differing exchange rates applied at foreign-currency shops, for tourism and Aeroflot air fares. Thus, there are a variety of values for the ruble. This gives Japanese businessmen difficulty in determining how to base their envisaged profits on which exchange rate. I think that perestroyka will address this problem. Thus, there are various uncertainties in the Soviet Union. I think that these problems should be resolved one by one.

The Japanese people firmly believe that the economic reform policy being pursued by the Soviet Union is moving in a very good direction and will lead to future development without fail. In the course of promoting this economic reform policy, it is necessary for the two countries not only to make efforts and show sincerity, but to generate ideas. I feel that it is truly necessary for Japanese-Soviet relations to stand on a foundation different from the past after they are fully reviewed.

As [words indistinct] indicated, Japan and the Soviet Union have yet to conclude a peace treaty. In addition, the 100 million people in Japan yearn for the resolution of the northern territories issue, which remains unresolved. I think that it is necessary to place Japan-Soviet relations in a politically stable framework through the conclusion of a peace treaty after resolving the northern territories issue.

[Reporter] Mr. Ambassador, I understand that you have answered this question. What are your optimistic views and concerns while working in Moscow? I understand that you have already answered this question to some extent.

[Edamura, laughing] Well, this question was asked in the previous interview. I think that the Soviet Union is moving in a very good direction. However, I have found many problems in the present situation. I hope that the Soviet Union is not too sticky about these problems and does not see them as serious.

Various debates are held on Soviet economic reform in public places. In view of these debates, I think that the economic reform is not an easy thing to be carried out. In view of the economic reform and relations between the Soviet federation and republics, I think that the Soviet Union is faced with many difficulties. Regarding these difficulties and obstacles, no other nations can avoid them.

Japan experienced various difficulties in promoting modernization in the Meiji era and in the post-war decades. Japan has also been faced with various difficulties and suffering. Therefore, I regard such difficulties as quite natural. I also think that if the Soviet Union has the will and ability to overcome the difficulties, its future prospects are bright.

Now, I am talking freely in this interview with Moscow Radio soon after I came here and this is something new. For example, as you just mentioned a while ago, IZVESTIYA, an organ of the Soviet Government, had come to me for an interview before I left Tokyo for the Soviet Union and carried the interview article just when I arrived here. I think that this represents that Soviet society is changing.

The Japanese have memories of the past. For example, the Japanese people have varying impressions of Moscow Radio. Sometimes, Moscow Radio has broadcast to the Japanese people that Japan is trying to revive its militarism or Japan is conspiring with American imperialists. However, they can find the present Soviet Union to be quite different from their conventional impressions.

We have to reform our thinking. The Soviet Union is no longer a special nation to Japan. We need to reform our thinking to view the Soviet Union as a neighbor with which we can easily associate.

Regarding the question as to whether I view future Japan-Soviet relations optimistically, I think that the Japanese people will change their thinking in that way. As you asked in your last question, there are difficult issues pending between Japan and the Soviet Union. As you are aware, they include the territorial issue, the issue of confirming borders, and the issue of concluding a peace treaty.

In connection with these issues, President Gorbachev definitely has said that he would visit Japan next year. What is more, the president has said in Washington that he would open full dialogue with Japan, taking advantage of his visit to Japan. In view of his remarks, we can expect Japan and the Soviet Union to hold talks and move toward resolving the fundamental issue impeding the development of relations between the two countries. Therefore, I am going to fulfill my duties with optimism.

Edamura, Rogachev Discuss Ties

LD2606211990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1315 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 26 Jun (TASS)—Today Igor Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, received Sumio Edamura, Japanese ambassador in the USSR, in connection with the forthcoming presentation of credentials.

During the exchange of opinions which took place on questions of relations between the USSR and Japan there was a discussion of certain practical aspects of the further development of Soviet-Japanese political dialogue in the light of the forthcoming official visit to Japan by USSR foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in September.

Need for Cold War Japan-U.S. Treaty Questioned

PM2706090590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Result of the 'Cold War'"]

[Text] Tokyo, 23 Jun—The security treaty "became a reliable foundation for comprehensive cooperation between our countries and helped preserve peace and stability in Asia," that is how U.S. President G. Bush and Japan's prime minister, T. Kaifu, described this bilateral military pact, which entered into force exactly 30 years ago, in a joint statement published here today.

Born at the height of the "cold war," throughout this period it represented the "pivot" around which the two countries' military-political alliance was based. According to the terms of the treaty, the United States received the right to site an unlimited number of its troops on Japanese territory. As a result, the Pentagon equipped more than 100 bases and various military facilities here housing approximately 50,000 U.S. soldiers and officers. The Japanese side has no control over the movement of U.S. troop units, the quantity and nature of the military hardware sited at the bases, and, most importantly, the presence of nuclear weapons there.

The relaxation of East-West tension and the swift destruction of "cold war" structures gave rise to serious doubts here as to the need for the security treaty left over from the era of confrontation. However, ruling circles in Washington and Tokyo are still clutching at the past. Thus, in today's statement G. Bush and T. Kaifu stressed that the "treaty will retain in the future too its significance as a vitally important instrument for ensuring the two countries' freedom and security, and peace and prosperity in the region."

This course is at variance with the viewpoint of most opposition parties. In particular, Tsuruo Yamaguchi, Central Executive Committee secretary general of the leading opposition party, the Japan Socialist Party, in a statement to mark today's anniversary called for a change in the military nature of the treaty, "laying the stress on cooperation in the political and economic spheres." The Komeito Party said that Japan must "help build the kind of international community in which there would be no need for a security treaty." The Japan Communist Party once again called for this military pact's immediate abrogation.

Said To Hamper Disarmament

OW2706110390 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 22 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Listeners, 23 June is the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. Recently, a round table conference was held by several Soviet experts to exchange views in this connection. Among those who participated in the event, held at the Soviet NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY, were Major General Batenin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and an expert in this field; Admiral (Ameriko), [words indistinct]; and Titarenko, director of the Far East Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. In this program today, we will give you a summary of the talks.

First, speaking about the role today of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, Major General Batenin said: The U.S. military strategy toward Japan has brought about three things with the help of the security treaty; i.e., the stationing of U.S. troops in Japan, creating a nuclear threat against the Soviet Union, and placing Japan under its nuclear umbrella.

In general, the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty conformed to world trends at that time. It is quite clear that the treaty is basically directed at the Soviet Union. It is incorrect to think the pact is militarily or politically targeted at a large area that includes China and Southeast Asia. However, one must assume that the power policy seen in ideological confrontations ranging from the Korean war to the current conflict in Cambodia will continue in the future.

Asian and Pacific nations feel uneasy about the military elements of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. This is because the treaty suggests a precondition that military means can be used for economic objectives now surfacing in the region. One of the objectives of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty is to contain provocations, and, as you will agree, this is an anachronistic task which the West used as an ideological shield during the cold war.

After hearing these words of Major General Batenin, Mr. Titarenko, director of the Far East Institute, said: I would like to add the following. The Japan-U.S. Security Treaty gave an impetus to recreating the Japanese armed forces under the name of the Self-Defense Forces [SDF], which was in violation of Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, and this has resulted in encouraging to a certain degree a militaristic trend in Japan.

The United States sought to have Japan take over its own security from the late 1970's to the early 1980's. Then, in the latter half of the 1980's, it sought to have Japan take over substantial responsibility for East Asian security. This eventually led the United States to request that Japan increase its defense spending to three percent of gross national product as is done by the NATO member nations. The Japanese Government, acknowledging U.S. concerns, responded by annually increasing its military spending by five to seven percent. Such increases were way above the increase rate of U.S. allies in Western Europe. However, because of steady economic growth, Japan's spending remained within one percent of GNP.

Japan has considerably strengthened its own combat capabilities and has become an important military force in the Far East. Experts rate Japanese SDF combat capabilities as number one in Asia and rank Japan as one of the world's major military powers. Japan's military capabilities must be taken into account when considering the military power balance in the Asia-Pacific region. Those were the words of Director Titarenko.

We have recently seen some progress in regional disarmament. We can first cite the Soviet Union's unilateral actions to reduce its troops and conventional arms in the Far East, withdraw Soviet troops from Mongolia, and abolish long- and short-range missiles in Soviet Asia under the U.S.-Soviet accord on intermediate-range nuclear forces. What effect does the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty have on the disarmament process in the Asia-Pacific region? Major General Batenin answered: We can say that the security treaty considerably hampers the disarmament process. The Japanese Government remains politically passive on this issue because it is bound by this treaty to U.S. nuclear strategies. There is no doubt that now when Soviet-U.S. dialogue is proceeding, this situation hampers the dialogue. The treaty can be detrimental; it might even cause a nuclear confrontation in the Asia-Pacific region.

It can be said that for the peace process to go forward, there must be good relations between the Soviet Union and Japan. However, the fact that there is still no peace treaty between the two countries might explain why the constructive proposals of President Gorbachev made in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk have made no headway. This was the view of Major General Batenin.

Admiral (Ameriko), on the other hand, said: Recently, there have been reports about U.S. plans to reduce its military presence in the Asia-Pacific region. According to Western news reports, the United States plans to cut

14,000 to 15,000 troops in the Asia-Pacific region. The Western reports claim that this means a 10-percent reduction of forces in the region. However, U.S. Congressional data shows that the number of troops stationed in the region is 362,000. The 14,000 to 15,000 troops represent not 10 percent but actually five percent of the total number of troops in the region. I think a reduction of this scale is merely a minor adjustment for decoration purposes, and it cannot change the overall situation. Perhaps, this was meant to be a propaganda gesture in response to the Soviet unilateral announcement on large-scale forces reductions, including 120,000 troops in the Soviet Far East. [passage omitted]

Director Titarenko then said: The U.S. plans for scaling down its military presence, which will continue until the year 2000, will in fact affect only some ground forces, and these forces do not play a decisive role in the Asia-Pacific region. As noted in the 18 April Defense Department report entitled "U.S. Strategy in the Asia-Pacific Region in the 21st Century," U.S. military strength in the region is actually being strengthened qualitatively rather than being reduced.

According to Defense Secretary Cheney, the reduction of U.S. Forces in Japan will be carried out in parallel with the strengthening of Japan-U.S. military cooperation under the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. Furthermore, several official documents of the U.S. Defense Department do not rule out the possibility of Japan becoming a military power in the 21st century, although this will be possible only when the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty is discarded.

Noting increased military exchanges between Japan and South Korea and increased loans extended by Japan to South Korea during the first half of the 1980's, Soviet and Western news agencies described the activities as the Washington-Seoul-Tokyo alliance and gave it the nickname, the United Nations of America. However, I must say that such an alliance is impractical. There are very strong anti- Japanese sentiments in South Korea because of Japan's past occupation of the Korean peninsula, and Article 9 of Japan's peace constitution prevents it from joining a collective defense structure. [passage omitted] As for military cooperation between the United States and Japan, it will probably continue to expand in every aspect henceforth. Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu, in a keynote speech this year, declared that a future for Japan without further strengthening the Japan-U.S. alliance under the security treaty is unthinkable.

Reports of Gorbachev Pressuring DPRK Denied

SK2706095890 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 21 Jun 90

[Text] TASS branded a U.S. magazine's assertions that at the recent summit talks, President Mikhail Gorbachev promised U.S. President George Bush that he would intensify pressure on the DPRK in order to make it soften its policy as a fabrication.

In his commentary, TASS commentator (?Avgold Virykov) also noted that THE U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT's assertion that the Soviet leader himself recognized the need to return the Kurile Archipelago to Japan as being untrue.

In the commentary, the TASS correspondent noted that a White House spokesman had rejected this report as a lie.

ROK Minister on Reducing Military Exercises

SK2606233790 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 24 Jun 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The ROK Defense Minister Yi Sang-hun explained his government's intention to reduce the scale of the "Team Spirit" military exercises which are held annually with the participation of the U.S. military.

Speaking before the National Assembly in Seoul, he said that this measure is to create an atmosphere of confidence between North and South Korea and that its mission is to cooperate in improving relations with (?North Korea).

The DPRK is insisting that the "Team Spirit" military exercises be completely abolished. According to opinions from Pyongyang, this military exercise is a barrier for peaceful reunification on the Korean peninsula.

ROK Accepts North's Proposal to Resume Talks

SK2706042790 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 25 Jun 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The ROK has officially accepted the DPRK proposal for the resumption of political dialogue. An ROK official, in a telephone message today, proposed that the delegations of both sides discuss the issue of preparing for a meeting of the heads of the governments on 3 July in Panmunjom located on the demarcation line that divides the North and the South.

The dialogue between the delegates of the North and the South held in June was suspended by the DPRK since Seoul refused to conduct the U.S.-South Korean military exercise, the "Team Spirit-90."

Some time ago, an official spokesman for the DPRK issued a statement calling for the resumption of dialogue starting from the sincere desire to settle the issue of peace and of the peaceful reunification of the country.

Today marks the 40th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean war. An Armistice Agreement was signed in July 1953.

Korean Solidarity Meeting Held in Moscow

PM2706095990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Solidarity Meeting"]

[Text] The 25 June meeting at Moscow's Vladimir Ilich electromechanical plant became an expression of the solidarity of our country's working people with the Korean people's struggle for their motherland's peaceful unification.

Kim Kye-se, DPRK charge d'affaires ad interim to the USSR, took part in the meeting.

DPRK, U.S. Scholars Meet in Pyongyang

SK2706012790 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 24 Jun 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] For the first time in the history of contacts between the DPRK and the United States, a seminar of the scholars of these two countries were held in Pyongyang.

What is attracting interest in this event is the fact that no diplomatic relations has been established between the two countries.

Discussions were held for six days on the construction of a socialist society in the DPRK; mutual efforts to resolve the issue of reunifying the Korean peninsula; and on the issue of normalizing relations between North Korean and the United States.

The U.S. scholars consisted of delegates from 12 universities. Among them were philosophers, physicists, and historians.

Among the North Korean delegates were leading scholars from the Institute for Disarmament and Peace Affairs affiliated to the Academy of Sciences and the Pyongyang University.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Nuclear Threat to Asia-Pacific Region Examined

OW2406205190 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Commentary by Barsov: "An Important Factor for Security"]

[Text] People in the Asia-Pacific region are very sensitive about issues with latent nuclear threats. This is understandable. Here, in Asia, the first atomic military attack took place. Two Japanese cities, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, were demolished by U.S. atomic bombs. Here in the Pacific, the tragedy of Bikini horrified the world when residents of the island became victims of U.S. nuclear tests. Here in the Asia-Pacific region, three of the five nuclear powers are located.

Eight years ago, on 16 June 1982, when the Soviet Union, following China, undertook the obligation of not being the first country to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances, people in the Asia-Pacific region responded most favorably to the Soviet declaration. They had hope that other nuclear powers might emulate such good examples, thereby greatly reducing the threat of nuclear war.

The important decision of two of the three nuclear powers in the Asia-Pacific region also gave a strong impetus to the relaxation movement in the region. In the movement, the Soviet Union and China regard each other as allies struggling for a nuclear-free world. The two countries are correct to believe so. In December 1986, the Rarotonga Treaty, which declared the pan-Pacific region a nuclear free zone, entered into force. Fifteen countries and regions in the South Pacific signed the treaty. Joining the treaty as soon as it became effective, the Soviet Union signed the relevant protocol and became a guarantor nation ensuring that the region would be kept free from nuclear weapons. Shortly after, China declared its endorsement of the Rarotonga Treaty.

As for the other three nuclear powers—the United States, Britain, and France—they refuse to endorse, under all kinds of pretexts, the efforts by the countries to eliminate nuclear weapons in the South Pacific. We have witnessed a similar situation in the mentality and attitude toward turning Southeast Asia into a nuclear free zone. The Soviet Union and China have all along sided with members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations on this issue. However, the Western nuclear powers have opposed the ASEAN member nations' aspirations to keep the region free of nuclear weapons. The pretext used by the Western nuclear powers to cover up their opposition has become increasingly unharmonious with the reality in the world today, much less with the interests of the people of countries in the region.

Soviet leader Gorbachev's recent visit to the United States and his talks with U.S. President Bush have given rise to new hope of a decrease in the confrontation between the two major powers in the Asia-Pacific Region. The growth of their mutual trust and cooperation in relaxing tension will increase the possibility of eliminating nuclear weapons and the danger of nuclear war in the region.

Vietnam Plans To Suspend Work Force Abroad

90UF0264A Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Jun 90 p 3

[Report by correspondent A. Kalashnikov: "What Working Abroad Is Like for the Vietnamese]

[Text] Hanoi, June—Tran Dinh Hoan, minister of labor, war invalids, and social welfare of the SRV, declared in an interview with VIA [Vietnam Information Agency] that the Vietnamese Government intends, as before, to develop cooperation with foreign countries in the field of labor resources. The minister, VIA observes, thereby "refutes the false reports which have appeared in certain foreign mass media concerning the fact that our country has ceased sending workers overseas and is bringing them back from East European countries early in consequence of the 'anti-Vietnam mood' which has emerged there."

At the same time the minister announced that in agreement with the governments of the USSR, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria, Vietnam has decided this year to either suspend or reduce the number of workmen which we export. "We hope that the situation in these countries will quickly stabilize and then we will be able to sign new contracts on cooperation in the sphere of labor resources which will produce good results," he said.

With the recent changes in the political and socioeconomic life of fraternal countries, the interviewee goes on to say, new aspects affecting Vietnamese workers have arisen also. Primarily the problem of surplus manpower. Some enterprises have been in a hurry to resolve it at the expense of Vietnamese workers, many of whom have been dismissed. "We intend to seriously discuss these problems at intergovernmental level," the minister emphasized, "and, if necessary, bringing our workers home ahead of schedule and seeking to ensure that neither their interests nor those of the corresponding countries suffer." At the present time approximately 200,000 Vietnamese citizens work abroad.

The countries which have workers from the SRV were recently visited by specially formed interdepartmental delegations. They included journalists also. Following their return to Hanoi, a series of articles on this subject appeared in the central papers. The HANOI MOI correspondent, for example, observes that the situation of Vietnamese workers in the USSR has begun to change for the better. The Soviet people, he believes, have become convinced that this cooperation corresponds to the interests of both parties and is of a mutually profitable nature.

There has been a cardinal change in the attitude toward the Vietnamese workers in Bulgaria, the article notes. They are being dismissed from the enterprises on any pretext, and there are constant clashes between Bulgarians and Vietnamese. The local papers are writing that the Vietnamese are merely intensifying the unemployment problem in the country. Yet everyone knows, the correspondent observes, that they are employed in fields in which Bulgarians simply do not want to work.

Nor is the Czechoslovak press sparing the Vietnamese, HANOI MOI maintains. And following the amnesty for 20,000 criminals, the safety of SRV citizens working there is in jeopardy. They do not risk being on the streets alone after dark.

The Vietnamese press also reports that 5,000 Vietnamese are without work in the GDR. And that following the opening of the borders with the FRG, 4,000 have crossed to the West.

Rogachev Talks With New Zealand Official

PM2606142990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 22 June I.A. Rogachev, deputy USSR foreign minister, received H. Judd, assistant secretary for foreign affairs at the New Zealand Ministry of External Relations and Trade.

The conversation touched on certain questions of Soviet-New Zealand relations, as well as a number of topical international problems. New Zealand Ambassador J. McArthur was present at the conversation.

Near East & South Asia

Israel's Pledge To Change Policy Doubted

LD2606142190 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] The Israeli minister of housing construction, Ari'el Sharon, who handles the question of new settlers in the occupied Arab lands, has given assurances that no more Soviet immigrants will be directed to settle in those areas. His pledge was backed by the Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir. Is this a genuine change of policy or just a maneuver?

I have a dubious impression of their statements, comments our observer Aleksandr Pogodin. On the one hand it should be satisfying that both Shamir and Sharon, who is known as the main hawk in the hawkish government, have come up with those unexpected pronouncements. Note that the Washington administration gave them its full approval on Monday, 25 June.

On the other hand, there is not enough ground for rejoicing over the pledges by the Israeli leaders. The statements contain too many circumlocutions, equivocations and vague illusions allowing of any interpretation.

Let me point out that the exact promise is that the immigrants from the Soviet Union will not be directed to found new settlements. Nothing is said about ruling out their participation in other forms of colonization of the occupied lands. What is more, a reservation has been made that each Israeli citizen is free to choose place of residence in accordance with the democratic principles. That leaves widescope for manuevers and manipulations.

Then Tel Aviv's statement mentioned only the West Bank of the Jordan and Gaza Strip. The policies concerning the eastern Arab part of Jerusalem and other territories seized in 1967 are to be unchanged. There are other vague and ambivalent expressions that call in doubt any radical change in Israel's position.

There are too many signs that the move boils down to an attempt to mollify Moscow's resolute stand on plans to settle Jews leaving the Soviet Union in the occupied Arab lands. There is also a desire to placate Washington, disapproving the colonisation of those lands.

I cannot predict the Soviet official response, concludes Aleksandr Pogodin, but it looks to me that what is behind the Sharon and Shamir statements boils down to a camouflage of Tel Aviv's former expansionist policy.

Rescue Mission for Iranian Quake Victims Departs

LD2606130690 Moscow TASS in English 1225 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Eleonora Sutotskaya]

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—A group of 24 Soviet surgeons, orthopedists and children's doctors are leaving by a special Aeroflot flight for Iran today, taking along one hundred tents, each for ten people, 2000 blankets and medication kits. They will act as a Soviet Red Cross Society special rescue squad to help Iran's earthquake victims.

"The Soviet people were swift to respond to the disaster that rocked Iran and to the appeal for aid," deputy chief of the Soviet Red Cross Association Alexey Tyulandin told TASS.

"The first group of rescuers and doctors, including members of the Armenian Spitak squad, left the Soviet Union for Iran the day after the earthquake struck. The 6.5 tonnes of supplies dispatched to Iran on the same day included cars, special equipment, tents, blankets and 15,500 individual medical kits.

Offers of help came from every Soviet republic. The Azerbaijani Government and Red Crescent Society have dispatched two trains carrying rescuers and doctors, as well as medical equipment and medication from Baku to Iran.

The Tadzhikistan Red Crescent Society has prepared tents and is ready to send Farsi-speaking doctors.

The Armenian Red Cross Society has offered money and the Karelian Red Cross is collecting donations, including money and clothing for the needy.

Azerbaijan President Sends Condolences to Iran

NC2506114490 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 22 Jun 90

[Text] President Ayaz Mutalibov has sent a telegram of condolences to President Hashemi-Rafsanjani. The telegram said:

Your Excellency, I convey my condolences in deep grief to you and to all the people of the Islamic Republic of Iran on the tragic results of the earthquake. The report has saddened the hearts of millions of people in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, who have extended a fraternal hand of assisstance. I ask you to convey my deep regret to the families of those who have been killed and to those who have suffered.

Sends Aid to Victims

LD2506133490 Moscow TASS in English 1323 GMT 25 Jun 90

[Text] Baku June 25 TASS—Azerbaijan, whose president has announced a day of mourning over the disastrous earthquake in Iran, has dispatched a group of its best seizmologists to the site.

In the Azerbaijani cities of Astar and Lenkoran, bordering on Iran, tremors measured from six to 6.5 on the Soviet scale, Academician Akif Ali-Zade, director of the Azerbaijan Institute of Geology, told TASS.

The quake damaged old buildings, but none of the residents were hurt, he said.

In Baku, 360 kilometers north of the epicenter, the shudders registered from three to 3.5 points.

Azerbaijan is raising money, drugs, food, clothes and other basic items for Iranian quake victims.

Lenkoran residents have already raised 200,000 roubles in aid.

Azerbaijan has sent a caravan of large trucks, carrying 40 tonnes of flour, sugar, rice and 120 tents and 80 40-litre canisters with water.

Two Baku mosques have held mourning masses for those killed in the quake.

Emergency Aid Continues

PM2706083990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Dzhalilov under the rubric: "Events, Facts, Opinions": "Mark of Sorrow"]

[Text] Baku—A day's mourning has been declared in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] for those killed as a result of the earthquake in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

As early as the day after the event, a government commission headed by F. Mustafayev, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers, was formed to give emergency aid to the friendly people in eliminating the aftermath of the disaster.

This is what he told IZVESTIYA's correspondent:

"The first team of medics was sent to Iran by motor transport via Astara—surgeons, anesthetists, rheumatologists, and paramedics. They took along medicines, medicinal preparations, dressings, and also essential physicians' instruments. A team from Nakhichevan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] left for the disaster area even earlier. Rescue and reconstruction teams and seismology specialists are also preparing to depart...."

The Azerbaijan Government has given urgent instructions to the republic's ministries and departments to devise specific proposals for giving other emergency aid to the victims and to submit them to the commission.

Azerbaijan SSR President A. Mutalibov and G. Gasanov, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, have sent telegrams of condolences to Iran's President A. Hashemi Rafsanjani in connection with the earthquake's tragic consequences.

Armenia Sends Aid for Iran's Earthquake Victims

PM2706080790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by special correspondents S. Bablumyan and F. Ivanov under general heading "Iran: 12 Cities Destroyed"]

[Text] Tehran—Emergency aid for Iran has arrived from Armenia. Rescue workers from the "Spitak" Detachment arrived in the disaster zone immediately after the terrible earthquake. Following them, our aircraft prepared to fly out crammed with medicine, clothes, breathing apparatus, and other items that are needed so badly by the people hit by the disaster. After a flight of just over an hour, our Tu-154 landed in Tehran.

The first words we heard on leaving the plane were: "Our heartfelt thanks to you for your sympathy and support." They were spoken by an airport worker but, judging by the reaction of the Iranians alongside, they were spoken not only on his behalf.

The night sky in Tehran is full of dozens of planes waiting to land or take off. After unloading, some of them waited at the stands until dawn: aircraft from U.S., Polish, and South Korean airlines. We recognized our Tu-154 from Moscow among them.

In the customs hall, local television was showing a film of the tragic events: Totally destroyed cities and towns, hospitals full of the injured, rescue workers trying to pull survivors from under the debris, soldiers unloading aircraft.... We all are very familiar with all this from the tragic days of December 1988 in Armenia. But can we grow accustomed to human suffering?

An Iranian alongside me named the population centers which the disaster had hit hardest: Zandaran, Rasht, Mazandaran, Zanjan, Gilan....

A. Shakverdyan, deputy chairman of the Armenian Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], who flew into Tehran together with the Armenian delegation, listed what else ought to be additionally sent. Mobile power stations, which had to be left at Yerevan's Zvartnots Airport—they simply would not fit in the Tu-154 airliner—would be very useful. Incidentally, there was no room on the plane for a considerable amount of quite bulky cargo. In all probability it will be delivered by the next Aeroflot flight.

Tehran Airport workers asked us to proceed to the Iranian Air Force base nearby, where the headquarters organizing unloading work has been set up. We were told that there have already been four flights from the USSR to Iran, and another two were expected tonight. A. Mayrapetyan, Armenian deputy health minister, proposed sending extra medicine, bandages, and anesthetics—this proposal was gratefully accepted.

During our first few hours in Tehran we observed that the services coordinating, and organizing the work are operating in a smooth and well-oiled manner. Orders coming, and this is important, from one person—in this case a general—are carried out immediately and unquestioningly. There were just as many people as required by the situation, and all of them were working. We do not know what will happen in the disaster area—where the situation is more complex, of course—but those were our first impressions.

And in conclusion we would like to thank the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Foreign Ministry which, in the space of literally a few hours, resolved all issues associated with the IZVESTIYA journalists' trip to Iran.

Afghanistan's Najibullah on 'Overcoming Crisis'

LD2706100590 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] Kabul June 27 TASS—The Second Congress of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan opened here today. In his report, the party chief Najibullah analysed the party's activity and assessed the April 27, 1978 uprising of army officers supported by the people, the beginning of the undeclared war against Afghanistan and the bringing in of Soviet troops, which, he said, was not in keeping with Afghanistan's national interests.

He dwelt on cardinal changes now taking place in the People's Democratic Party to achieve greater democratisation and openness in its activity. The report contains the analysis of the current situation and ways of overcoming the existing crisis.

The delegates of the party forum warmly received the congratulatory message to the congress from the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

Afghan Government Success Causes Rebels' Confusion

PM2606130790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 June 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "The Initiative Is in Our Hands"]

[Text] Kabul, 22 Jun—The Armed Forces of the Republic of Afghanistan have recently made a significant advance in the sphere of combat training. They are successfully implementing the combat operations experience they accumulated earlier against the armed formations of the intransigent opposition. All this is the result of meticulous work carried out in the army at all levels, Colonel General M.A. Watanjar, Afghanistan's defense minister, told a TASS correspondent.

The Armed Forces of the Republic of Afghanistan, the minister noted, adhere fimly to a defensive doctrine. The Afghan people are tired of the endless and exhausting war, which is being imposed on them from outside. They expect peace, and no one can disregard these feelings. However, part of the armed opposition does not recognize any language other than force, and our troops are forced to fittingly rebuff its intrigues. Otherwise the opponent will not come to the negotiating table.

The 16 months of autonomous defense of the homeland inarguably testify to the fact that the rebel forces are running out of steam, and their morale is also falling. To all intents and purposes, military operations are being conducted only in the south and southeast regions of the country—in Paktia, Lowgar, Ghazni, and Zabol Provinces, and partly in Nangarhar and Qandahar Provinces. Relative calm is being maintained in other provinces. The role played by the security of communications in the normal provision of vital supplies to the cities and other settlements is well known. The enemy is also aware of this, but his attempts to gain success in the "highways war" have been stillborn. Extremely important highways such as the Hayraton-Kabul and Towraghondi-Qandahar highways are functioning normally. We are preparing to open the Qandahar-Qalat highway.

Huge efforts were required in the past to secure even temporary control over the Kabul-Gardeyz road, but today civilian supplies flow along it unimpeded, without military escort. The Kabul-Jalalabad and Mazar-e Sharif-Mehman routes are open to traffic. A large part of Nangarhar Province is under the firm control of government troops. The defenders of Khowst are repelling all attacks by armed guerrillas of the intransigent opposition in the most difficult circumstances.

The initiative is in our hands. The successes of government troops have led to confusion among the opposition, and have sharpened disagreements in their camp, exposing the anti-people essence of their course of continuing the war "until a victorious conclusion." Nevertheless, we assume that the enemy will try to step up combat operations in the summer under pressure from outside forces. It will receive all it needs for this purpose from Pakistan, the United States, and Saudi Arabia.

The Afghan minister of defense expressed deep gratitude to the Soviet Union for its help, including help in the strengthening of the defensive capability of the Armed Forces. Your cooperation, in all the multitude of the forms it has taken, he stressed, is a guarantee that peace will be restored in Afghanistan. For our part, our task is to do everything necessary to achieve this aim.

Troops Clear Band of Rebels

LD2606005190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Jun 90

[Video from Kabul by correspondent Aleksandr Shkirando, identified by caption; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] In the environs of Kabul, government troops have carried out a successful operation to clear areas of bands of rebels.

[Shkirando] [video shows destroyed buildings with Afghan soldiers standing around] A few hours ago, the central headquarters of the irreconcilable opposition was still here. Yesterday, orders still came from here to fire upon the Afghan capital. Leaders of the Peshawar Seven attached great significance to this den in the small town of Paghman situated just 15 km from Kabul. Taking into consideration the unusually difficult mountainous terrain and the multitude of subterranean passages and caves, the rebels turned it into an inaccessible fortress. Around the headquarters alone, we counted today 40 such dumps where rockets [reaktivnyy snaryad] and other ammunition was stored. [video shows uniformed soldiers and men in civilian dress passing shells to each other from a dump, and an Islamic flag is shown in close-up. More destroyed buildings and a tank are shown, as are armed civilians.] Over two days of fighting, already over 6,000 shells have been siezed. That Islamic flag fluttered here for eight whole years calling for the Jihad, the holy war with the infidels. Not only inhabitants of Kabul perished under this flag, but the people of Paghman themselves. In the small town of Paghman, which for many centuries was the favorite recreation place of Afghans, practically not one house has remained intact. The Arc of Victory erected here in 1919 in honor of the restoration of independence won by Afghan patriots in the difficult struggle against British colonizers also fell in the (?battle against) the infidels.

[M. Sharif, commander of the front, identified from caption, in vernacular, with superimposed translation into Russian by Shkirando] That operation was carried out with the active participation of all types of Armed Forces. At the concluding stage, a great role was played, supported from the division from the Jowzjan Province, created on a voluntary basis. Today is really a holiday for us, a holiday of great victory. But there is no time to celebrate. Unfortunately, some such support points of the irreconcilable opposition still remain around Kabul.

However, we will do everything to ensure that in the near future, the normal peaceful life is reestablished in the capital.

Ulyanovsk Mosque Named After Saudi King

LD2506171190 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 25 Jun 90

[Text] Ulyanovsk June 25 TASS—A new mosque being built in the Russian city of Ulyanovsk will be named after King Fahd bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz Al Sa'ud of Saudi Arabia, Mufti Talgat Tadzhuddin, head of the Muslim religious board for the European part of the USSR and Siberia, told a ground breaking ceremony in the city.

King Fahd donated 20,000 U.S. dollars for construction, Tadzhuddin said.

The ceremony was attended by Muslim representatives from Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, Singapore and Japan.

Significance of Hajj to Saudi Arabia Reviewed

LD2606153290 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The Muslim world has entered the last month, Zolheja, of the year 1410 of its calendar. By centuries old tradition this month is marked by massive pilgrimage, the hajj, to the Islamic shrines, the center of which are in Mecca and Medina in Saudi Arabia. [passage omitted]

About 1,500 pilgrims from the Soviet Union are already in the holy places.

For the number of practicing muslims, the Soviet Union can be called one of the largest Islamic countries of the world. The 1,500 pilgrims from among the many hundreds of thousands that will gather in the holy places may be a very small figure, writes our commentator Oleg Shchedrov, but progress is impressive if we consider the fact that in previous years no more than 50 pilgrims reached Mecca from the Soviet Union during the days of the hajj. This first really massive pilgrimage by muslims from the Soviet Union also shows the growth in religious sentiments and changes in the attitude of the state to religious believers. [passage omitted]

Naturally, there were many more people wishing to make the pilgrimage than there were seats on the charter planes. The selection of the more worthy people was done by regional spiritual boards of Muslims which are independent religious organizations.

The dispatch of the pilgrims inevitably came up against technical difficulties considering the lack of experience. The financial issue was very acute. The trip to Mecca proved to be rather expensive—roughly combined average Soviet wage for two years. [passage omitted]

In all likelihood, the rather massive hajj from the Soviet Union will be repeated in the years to come. It may do a good service in starting constructive relations between the Church and the State in the USSR. It is also important that this is a fine opportunity to lay another informal small bridge between Moscow and Riyadh that have no diplomatic relations.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Meets Mozambique's Finance Minister

PM2106153790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report under the general heading "Talks Held"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze met 20 June with Mozambican Finance Minister M. Osman, who passed on a message from Mozambican President J. Chissano to M.S. Gorbachev.

During the talk opinions were exchanged on improving bilateral ties, including in the economic sphere, and switching to cooperation on a mutually advantageous basis. Certain specific areas which could be of interest to both countries' economies were discussed. The talks also touched on the situation in southern Africa and other international issues of mutual interest.

Komplektov Receives Zimbabwe Official

PM2206122390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 18 June V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received T. Zhikon [name as transliterated], permanent secretary of the Zimbabwe foreign ministry. There was an exchange of opinions on the political processes taking place in the world and the situation in Southern Africa.

South African Party Leader Interviewed

MB2106160390 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] As we have already mentioned in our program, the leader of the Democratic Party [DP] of South Africa, Wynand Malan, recently visited the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee. This is what he told our reporter:

[Begin recording] [Malan] Before you allow the press, the media, to ask me questions, may I just say that it was a wonderful time. We spent a beautiful week here. We had good meetings. I was also very pleased with the opportunity we had to just travel on the metro, walking on the streets, going into restaurants or cafes, traveling on the train, seeing the ordinary people. Certainly what is happening here is a major development. It is obviously of more importance for world history than, I think, is what is going on in South Africa. Both our countries are in a state of flux, and I am not trying to say that South

Africa is on the same level of importance, but to us it is because it is our home, and we certainly have to move out from an era which I think we certainly have seen the end of. We are in a period of transition, and I am optimistic of our future.

[Unidentified correspondent] What then is your opinion about the changes that are now sweeping South Africa?

[Malan] There are different reasons. The one is a shift in moral development. The second is a belief, rightly or wrongly, that the economy, which is on the downturn, has something to do with apartheid. And thirdly, there is simply the force of the liberation movement coming to the fore, setting themselves in a political way, away from violent confrontation. Was it not for that shift there would not have been this. But I think all this is preceded by the developments in the region where the Soviet Union played a major part looking for political solutions in the region, committing itself, for instance, to the Namibia solution, getting involved in the Angola and Mozambique questions, and really trying to find a political settlement. The kind of shifts in American policy, vis a vis the region, the shift in the Soviet policy, the Europe approach—there was a convergence, it seems to me, of self-interest which started in the region and then triggered the political solution of the internal dynamics of South Africa.

[Correspondent] The stance of the incumbent government of South Africa is finding understanding in many countries, although a great deal remains to be done to dismantle the system of apartheid.

[Malan] I am obviously overjoyed with the developments of Mr. de Klerk's new position since 2 February. The platform that he is implementing now, his policy now, is what we campaigned for in the elections in September last year: the unbanning of the ANC [African National Congress], the unbanning of the South African Communist Party, the release of prisoners, the end of the state of emergency. That was our platform, and that is our kind of approach. We are supporting this heavily, but at the same time we have our opposition to some of the approaches that the government still [words indistinct] which have not shifted fully to a national question but are still power oriented.

And secondly, on the economic scene, the government takes a line which is highly free market, the protection of existing privilege and existing assets, whereas we are talking about redistribution of wealth, the kind of social market economy where the peoples can get involved. There must be some active redistribution, and at the same time there must be a development of markets to balance the economy which we need. There we are still heavily opposed. But as to the developments there we have seen the end, in a sense, of the apartheid era. This will be the last of the kicking of a dying system.

We will soon, within the next year or 18 months, move into formal negotiations, hopefully multiparty negotiations, and we will establish democracy with some protection and some autonomy for culture, language, religion, or whatever. But it will not be [word indistinct] faced, it will be a real democracy. At the moment we find ourselves in transition. There is a kind of joint management of the situation at the moment by the National Party [NP] government and the ANC. There is a risk, or course, of that deteriorating into some kind of joint security rule. There is no real progress on the process. But by and large it looks beautiful, the situation is healthy, it is open, it is moving close to glasnost. Perestroyka will only come in another few years' time, but we are at least in the glastnost era of South Africa.

[Correspondent] The press, radio, and television all over the world are covering the tour the vice president of the ANC, Nelson Mandela, is making of many countries, prior to that the highlight of the tour of South Africa's president, Frederik de Klerk. [sentence as heard] How do you assess those trips?

[Malan] I think the tours of both Mr. de Klerk and Mr. Mandela are important. I think it is important for all the political groupings in South Africa to have contact with the international world. I think it is important that the international world can get a broader perspective of the picture that is going on there. I would not want to play off—as the media is doing, and in a sense also the ANC and the NP government have been doing—the one against the other, which is more successful. In my way of thinking, it is important that both of them be able to state their position so that whenever policy is to be framed from the internatonal community, that they understand the broader spectrum.

[Correspondent] Undoubtedly, exchanges of opinion and mutual contacts are most important, both at presidential level and at the level of political parties and public organizations. What did you as leader of the DP achieve by your trip to the Soviet Union?

[Malan] Well, let me go back to [word indistinct] that was important. When I returned from [word indistinct] I reported back in South Africa [word indistinct] 1988 that glasnost was for real—the openness with which the people there participated in the discussions, and suddenly there was an openness, and also about the system here, and I perceived at the time that it was almost a kind of mini-renaissance happening in the Soviet Union. That was fascinating to me because it was what I was working for in South Africa in the same way.

And I did think that we could learn something, some parallels, although we are coming from different sides, to a real democratic society—authoritarianism in both countries, of a kind, different economic systems, but surely moving to what will be more or less the same economic system. It was the parallels, without overstating, that caused me to accept the invitation. At the same time I thought that I could make a contribution to the formulation of policy here by simply sharing my perspectives of what is happening in South Africa. I again want to thank you for the invitation, a very kind invitation. Thank you very much. [end recording]

South Africa's 'Pace of Reform' Unsatisfactory

MB2606165490 Moscow in Zulu to Southern Africa 1930 GMT 22 Jun 90

[Commentary by (Julian Leboye), Nigerian international correspondent on abolition of Separate Amenities Act]

[Text] South Africa's parliament has voted in favor of the scrapping of the Seperate Amenities Act in that country. Nigerian international correspondent (Julius Leboye) comments:

This law had been in force in South Africa since 1943, and barred the various nationalities in that country from sharing parks, beaches and rest rooms, as well as hospitals, halls, sporting facilities and many other facilities. The scrapping of this law is part of the reform process undertaken by the South African Government, towards a new and democratic South Africa.

On this road to reform, other notable changes have been the lifting of the state of emergency in the country, except in Natal Province, and the unbanning of several anti-apartheid organization. One of them, the South African Communist Party, is to be launched officially as a political party on 29 June. Other changes along the road have been the release of political prisoners, among them the world-renowned Nelson Mandela. The day is now not far off, when there will be negotiations between the government and other organizations in the country on the future of South Africa.

There are, however, still many laws that make life difficult for the majority of South Africans, and that is why the African National Congress [ANC] has announced that there are many conditions still not met to facilitate meaningful negotiations with the government. That is why Nelson Mandela has undertaken a tour of Africa, Europe, and America in a bid to get the leadership in the countries he visits to maintain sanctions against South Africa, as moves to the contrary would be premature.

As we may have observed from the sidelines, it is difficult to give a single and straightforward analysis of the South African situation. On the one hand it is obvious that political reform has visibly begun, and President F.W. de Klerk's efforts have not gone unnoticed by the international community. On the other hand, the pace of reform is not satisfactory to antiapartheid groupings like the ANC. Where does the truth on this issue lie? The change-over from apartheid to a free and democratic society cannot be an easy task, and there is a need for patience and compromise if the change is to be a success.

Three hundred years ago, the Dutch visited upon the nations of this region, and there began the cycle of greedy plundering, and repression of the indegenous peoples they found. These welcome visitors turned the nations into their slaves. Today South Africa has embarked on a road of reform and justice for all. We can only wish for a speedy resolution of the country's problems and the setting up of a democratic society where the indigenous peoples can once again feel that they belong, where the scourge of racism and apartheid is a thing of the past.

East Europe

Conditions for Stay of Troops in GDR Discussed

LD2606194190 Moscow TASS in English 1922 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov received today GDR State Secretary Guenter Krause, special representative of the GDR prime minister. They discussed the issues dealing with the financial and economic situation of a group of Soviet troops in the GDR. These problems emerged because of the coming into force on July 1 of the State Treaty on the currency, economic and social alliance between the GDR and West Germany.

On the same day Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Stepan Sitrayan discussed those issues with Krause.

Agreement was reached on the signing before the end of June of an intergovernmental agreement on mutually acceptable financial and economic conditions of the stay of Soviet troops in the GDR.

The day before Sitrayan held talks with Hans Werner Lautenschlager, state secretary of the West German Foreign Ministry, and senior executives of the West German Ministry of Finance on some economic and financial issues, stemming from the State Treaty on the currency, economic and social alliance between the two German states.

Further on Hostage-Taker Killed in GDR

LD2606124390 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0954 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Burg (ADN)—The hostage-taker killed during an exchange of shots with the People's Police near Burg yesterday evening apparently wanted to flee to the USSR. Hans-Joachim Stephan, police chief in Magdeburg area, said at a press conference today that the heavily-armed man was a 19-year-old sergeant of the Western Group of the Soviet Forces from herrenkrug garrison in Magdeburg. He was responsible for armory in the army unit. The man had kidnapped a couple and their two children.

Investigations have revealed that the man had family problems and wanted to return to the Soviet Union. A policeman injured in the shooting was given out-patient treatment. The family has also been discharged from the hospital. The parents and children had suffered from shock.

Unity, Division in East Europe Identified

PM2606135190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed report followed by B. Rodionov article under general heading "The Healthy Reaction of Disintegration?"]

[Text] We now have the right to talk not just about the division of Europe, but also the division of East Europe, the Budapest newspaper MAGYAR HIRLAP wrote recently. [illegible] Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Yugoslav republics of Slovenia and Croatia, and the Soviet Baltic republics have each, in their own way, voted in elections to change their system. Romania, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union are continuing, publicly or privately, to experiment with reforming socialism.

You could even put it this way: The political boundary of Europe now runs through Brest, Chop, and Biharkeresztes (on the Hungarian-Romanian border—editor's note). But today, fortunately, there is still a great deal more that unites rather than divides the East European states that have embarked on the policy of radical changes and are carrying out gradual reforms. Millions of ties should not be broken all at once, since they may still be of use to all interested parties. The final solution is to overcome the split of Europe, and not to shift demarcation lines.

One can hope that political processes in Bucharest, Sofia, and Moscow will ultimately follow the same trend as they did in the other East European countries. Naturally, the most painful changes will be in the Soviet Union. On the one hand, because of historical reasons, it is more difficult for the opposition to get off the ground. On the other hand, any hasty step could lead to catastrophic consequences. A conservative putsch or a military coup would push the country backwards for a long time. The chemical reaction of disintegration—which, in our own view, is a healthy reaction—the catalyst of which was the Baltic republics, seems irreversible. But extremely careful handling and unlimited patience are needed. The Soviet Union will be among the last states to embark on the radical path of democratic transformations; evidently, a new generation of politicians must grow up for this purpose.

Meanwhile, the political forces heading the East European countries, which are still to a certain extent playing the role of experimental laboratories, must prove that they are capable of ensuring efficient government in their states, MAGYAR HIRLAP concludes.

[Rodionov begins] The opinions that we have set out from the Hungarian newspaper, considered the most authoritative abroad, which recently started being published by British newspaper magnate Robert Maxwell, are undoubtedly worthy of consideration. They reflect both the conviction that a radical change of system is the main path for all East European countries, and the fear that many advocates of this policy, who are all heading "toward Europe," may threaten the existing ties in the East which may still be of good use. We can only agree with the author that the final solution can only come from overcoming the split of Europe as a whole, and not from shifting the demarcation lines.

The article reflects the alarm that has seized the public both in Hungary and in other East European countries, caused by the faltering of our perestroyka processes. It stands to reason that the author is simplifying a contradictory picture when he writes about a healthy reaction of disintegration in our country, when he speculatively lines up some kind of a "waiting line into Europe" in which the Soviet Union ranks among the last. The reality is multifaceted. And the final warning by the article's author is quite appropriate: Only the future will show what will emerge from the "experimental retorts" in the East European countries where the system has been radically changed.

Emerging Czechoslovak Political Scene Viewed

PM2506153090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent S. Vtorushin: "Two Poles. Czechoslovakia After the Elections"]

[Text] Prague, Jun—The Czechoslovak elections are over. Politicians and media observers are assessing them. Everyone is stressing their democratic nature and calm atmosphere. Some people are trying to find something sensational in the results. However what happened was natural. Now the Federal Assembly will have to ratify the new government and elect the country's president. It is thought that this will take around a month.

The coalition of two social movements—"Civic Forum" and "Public Against Violence"—won a convincing victory. Its representatives polled 48.5 percent of the vote and will hold 170 of the 300 seats in the Federal Assembly.

The Communists, who came second, won a major success. Some 13.5 percent of voters voted for them. This is considerably more than the most optimistic forecasts and opinion polls had predicted. The communists will have 47 deputies' seats in the country's parliament. The bloc of parties under the general name of Christian Democratic Union came third.

What does this mean in political terms?

First and foremost, that the era of Czechoslovak postwar development has finally come to an end. The majority of the people rejected the institutions of the state system, ideology, and lifestyle that had existed for more than 40 years. Just what are the forces on which the republic's citizens are now pinning their hopes?

"Civic Forum" emerged on the first day of the "velvet revolution"—as people in Czechoslovakia refer to the events that followed 17 November last year. Its nucleus was "Charter '77"—an illegal organization that had consistently opposed the country's regime. It called on all social forces dissatisfied with the state of affairs in the state to unite and form a united front. That was how "Civic Forum"—headed by the intelligentsia and supported by the masses—was formed.

"Civic Forum" is heterogeneous. Its leadership includes people who have never been members of any party, former Communists expelled from the CPCZ [Czechoslovak Communist Party] after 1968, academics, and cultural figures. As it emerged, the Forum received considerable support from a number of parties—first and foremost, the Czechoslovak Socialist and People's Parties.

The main aim which "Civic Forum" set itself was to return society to democracy and humanism, which are the inalienable components of common human values. The country's new leadership, once in power, declared Marxist ideology to be alien to Czechoslovak society. The word "socialist" was removed from the name of the state and of the two republics. When V. Havel, the country's president, was asked if he was for or against socialism, he replied: "I'm for people living better."

V. Havel's five months in power have reaffirmed that most of the people share his position. Today he is the most popular political figure in the country.

Another aim of "Civic Forum" is to restore the ties between Czechoslovakia and the West European countries which were lost during the postwar decades. In this respect Czechoslovakia has sharply stepped up its foreign policy activeness. In just a few months the country's president has visited most West European states, the United States, and Canada. Agreements on travel without visas have been concluded with a number of states. The barbed wire entanglements have been removed from Czechoslovakia's border with Austria and the FRG. The number of Czechoslovak students studying in West European universities will increase sharply as of this year. Thousands of English-language teachers will come to Czechoslovakia from Canada and Britain.

In economic policy a firm course has been set for creating market relations. As Czechoslovak economic managers and politicians see it, the market means above all the total liberation of productive forces. To this end the new parliament will have to adopt a whole package of laws relating to privatization of the national economy, equality for all forms of ownership, incentives for enterprise, price formation, and the social protection of citizens.

As was announced even before the elections market relations will be introduced as of 1 January next year. And this was done deliberately. By announcing a number of unpopular measures beforehand, the new leadership put its program to a nationwide referendum, as it were. The victory by "Civic Forum" in the elections means that most of the population approves that program. Now it will be easier for the government to take steps toward the market.

But the country's new leadership also faces considerable problems. Politically these are above all the maintenance of unity. After all, "Civic Forum" is held together not by its organizational structure (it is quite shaky) but by the prestige of certain individuals. A very great deal will depend on further relations between them. Moreover, its partner organization in Slovakia—"Public Against Violence"—failed to achieve quite the same impressive success as "Civic Forum" achieved in the Czech krajs.

The disposition of political forces in Slovakia was quite different. The Christian Democrats headed by their leader J. Carnogursky still have quite strong positions in society even though they obtained fewer votes than they had thought (slightly more than 19 percent). In terms of the number of voters who voted for them they were only 10 percent behind "Society Against Violence." Almost 14 percent of the deputies' seats on the Slovak National Council will be taken by the People's Party, which holds nationalistic views.

A feature of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly is the fact that it adopts laws by a three-fifths majority. So the Slovak deputies' votes will be of very great significance when fundamental decisions are made. That is why the "Civic Forum" leadership announced even before the final election results were in, that, despite its crushing victory, the new government would nonetheless be a coalition.

There was no great choice of coalition partners. Cooperation with the Communists was rejected from the outset, as they say. This left the Christian Democrats and the Movement for Autonomous Democracy—Moravia and Silesia Society, whose very name shows that it holds separatist views. Nobody has any doubt that it is the Christian Democrats who will be asked to take part in a political alliance.

This was reaffirmed by President V. Havel's meeting with J. Carnogursky, the details of which have not yet been reported. But relations between "Civic Forum" and the Christian Democrats were overshadowed by an incident involving Joseph Bartoncik, chairman of the Czechoslovak People's Party. Less than two days before the elections, when any campaigning was banned, Deputy Interior Minister J. Ruml, whose attitude to "Civic Forum" is well known, accused J. Bartoncik of having been a paid state security agent for 17 years. The party chairmen immediately stated that this action had just one aim—to compromise the Christian Democratic Union in the voters' eyes.

The end of the affair is not yet clear, but we must assume that the incident itself did not promote a strengthening of trust between "Civic Forum" and the Christian Democrats.

The Communist Party is in an entirely new position. On the one hand, the fact that such a large percentage of voters voted for it came as a surprise to many. It transpired that, despite the profound internal crisis and the considerable reduction in its ranks, the party has quite widespread support in society. But, at the same time, none of the other parties wants to cooperate with it.

I think that this is a temporary phenomenon. We will play the part of an opposition working within a democratic framework, L. Adamec, chairman of the CPCZ, stated. The decisive point for us now is to be able to come up with our own initiatives and proposals—decisions which will be in working people's interests.

Many Soviet people currently visiting Czechoslovakia ask: What has the country become, is it still moving down the socialist road or has it rejected it? It is not easy to answer those questions. Because it turns out that socialism is not a garrison that looks the same whatever side of the border it is on.

One thing can be firmly stated: The Czechoslovak leadership has set its sights on creating a dynamic society with a highly efficient economy, a developed culture and democracy, a high living standard, and with its doors open wide to the best ideas from East or West. It has focused its policy and practical activity on the interests of the individual and the creation of conditions for the development of each individual's creative potential. It is hard to say just now to what extent this will succeed. But one thing is beyond doubt—society has embarked on an entirely different path.

In this connection we cannot fail to mention one aspect of current Soviet-Czechoslovak relations. You get the impression that the changes in Czechoslovakia have frightened some of our leaders, from enterprise directors to government members. Czechoslovakia continues to be our leading trade partner and a member of CEMA and the Warsaw Pact, but high-ranking guests from our country have virtually stopped visiting Prague.

This not only fails to promote the strengthening and expansion of our ties, but actually does a certain amount of damage to them. After all, in terms of its changes, which were begun five years later than in our country, Czechoslovakia has already outstripped us in terms of a whole number of things. We have completely stopped studying its economic experience. Not everything was bad before in this area, as some people might think. Not without reason do our compatriots' meat stores look like museum displays. Today there is virtually no cooperation in the agricultural sphere. But until quite recently there had been good prospects in this area. I may be so bold as to claim that they still exist.

Czechoslovakia is planning to privatize its national economy. This by no means shows that all enterprises will be handed over to private hands. Unprofitable enterprises will cease to exist, and some former state enterprises will turn into joint-stock societies and enterprises with the involvement of foreign capital. Totally new prospects for cooperation are opening up in this area. Why, for instance, should some people from our country not become co-owners of factories producing baby food, which is in such short supply in our country? We could also become co-owners of sewn goods, footwear, and other enterprises. Of course, this would require convertible currency. So perhaps we should use it for these purposes rather than to buy finished goods. However, I have not seen a single businessman from our country here.

Czechoslovakia has become a different country. But it is no less open to cooperation with us than it was before. Specific and businesslike cooperation rather than conversation around a festival table, as was the case in the past.

Claims to Vacated Base Camps in Hungary Debated

PM2706085590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Schedule Will Be Observed"]

[Text] Budapest, 23 Jun—At a sitting of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Commission in Budapest, Hungarian State Assembly deputies heard a report by representatives of the Hungarian delegation which held talks with Soviet Army leaders regarding the question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungarian territory.

It was announced at the sitting that the Soviet side intends to leave guard detail members from the Southern Group of Forces to guard some facilities if, when base camps are vacated, settlement is not made with respect to each individual facility, in other words if the Hungarian side does not comply with its Soviet partners' conditions. At the same time the Soviet side stressed that, even in such a case, the schedule for the withdrawal of subunits and hardware belonging to the Southern Group of Forces will be observed.

During the talks it was proposed, the Hungarian delegation's report pointed out, that if Hungary does not claim individual facilities in the unoccupied base camps, they could be used to set up joint Hungarian-Soviet-Western or Hungarian-Soviet enterprises to develop, for example, therapeutic facilities for tourists.

Aircraft Demonstration Flights in Romania Noted

LD2406175490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1202 GMT 24 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Bucharest, 24 June (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vasiliy Abrekov reports:

Test flights of civil and military planes held today in the town of Baciu were dedicated to the production of the 1,500th Yak-52 plane to be produced jointly with Soviet specialists at the town's aircraft construction plant. More than 20,000 people witnessed an air show, with the country's best pilots and parachutists taking part. [passage omitted]

The MiG-29 fighter was presented during the demonstration flights to the general public in Romania for the first time.

Shevardnadze, Yugoslavia's Loncar Exchange Cables

LD2406124490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1405 GMT 23 Jun 90

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and B. Loncar, federal secretary for foreign affairs of the SFRY, have exchanged telegrams of congratulations in connection with the 50th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries, which falls on 24 June.

In his telegram, E.A. Shevardnadze stresses that the historical period, packed with dramatic events, that has passed since the moment at which that decision was made, confirms that it corresponded to the fundamental interests of the Soviet and Yugoslav peoples, and played an important role in developing and strengthening friendly ties and cooperation based on equal rights between the two states. This was likewise manifested during the years of the joint struggle against fascism and in the post war period. Today, cooperation between the USSR and the SFRY is actively promoting our countries' search for ways of building a humane and just society, and serves the interests of restructuring international relations according to new principles. The friendship with Yugoslavia, which has deep roots, is held dear in the Soviet Union, and its peoples wish success and prosperity.

B. Loncar noted that the 50th anniversary of establishing diplomatic relations between Yugoslavia and the USSR is an important date for both countries, summing up an entire historical period filled with dramatic events. The experience amassed over half a century contains the knowledge that peoples who have strengthened the roots of friendship in the joint struggle of World War II must be governed above all by the values of mutual respect and cooperation based on equal rights, and must implement today not only their own fundamental interests, but must also by their example and their actions strengthen the new way of thinking in international relations as a whole.

Soviet Parliamentarians Arrive in Yugoslavia

LD2406171790 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 24 Jun 90

[by TASS correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev]

[Text] Belgrade June 24 TASS—A delegation of the Soviet parliament's foreign affairs committee, headed by committee chairman Aleksandr Dzasokhov, arrived in Belgrade on Sunday at the invitation of the Yugoslavian National Assembly.

Soviet parliamentarians will be received at the Yugoslavian presidium, meet the leadership of the National Assembly, government and union secretariat for foreign affairs.

They are expected to discuss Soviet and Yugoslavian domestic affairs, international activities, the state of and prospects for bilateral cooperation.

They will pay particular attention to interparliamentary relations and share experience of work of the two countries' highest legislative bodies.

West Europe

European Council Meets on CSCE, Market Reforms

LD2606213690 Moscow TASS in English 1928 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Sergey Oleinik and Aleksandr Sisnev]

[Text] Dublin June 26 TASS—EC member states are interested in the success of the political and economic reforms initiated by President Gorbachev. They support the efforts of the Soviet Union to make progress towards a democratic system and a market-oriented economy, says a final communique of the EEC summit adopted today.

The communique said that the European Council asked the commission of the European Communities to prepare proposals for supporting the Soviet Union's policy of structural reform. EC member states welcomed democratic transformations in East European countries and reaffirmed their resolve to further support the process of political and economic reform.

The communique stressed the important role played by the CSCE in the process of changes in Europe. "At a time when our continent is actively engaged in surmounting its divisions, the CSCE provided a necessary framework for maintaining stability and promoting cooperation in Europe and for deepening the reforms that are underway," it said.

It welcomed the decision taken by the member states of the CSCE to convene in Paris a summit of heads of state and government. "It should be an opportunity to define the crucial role which the CSCE will play in the future architecture in Europe and in establishing a new set of relations between participating states, based on the Helsinki principles," it said.

EC leaders suggested that heads of state and government of CSCE members states, as well as their foreign ministers, should meet regularly. The communique proposed to create a permanent working CSCE secretariat for coordinating talks within the framework of this process.

Belgian Telephone Contract Removes 'Obstacles'

PM2506095590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[B. Moskvichev report: "Contract of the Century"]

[Text] Brussels—They have been talking about it in Belgium since 1987, when the firm Bell Telephone Manufacturing (BTM), a subsidiary of Alcatel, began talks with the Soviet side on supplying the USSR with "System 12" telephone exchanges, which can provide

50,000 telephone lines. The contract is estimated to be worth 1 billion Belgian francs. It is planned to form a joint venture for this purpose. In the future it will manufacture the very latest telephone exchanges, which our country obviously needs.

For a long time the joint wish to implement this mutually advantageous proposal came up against a major obstacle in the form of Cocom [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls], according to which the supply of telephone exchanges to the Soviet Union could seriously damage the defense of the West. Repeated attempts by the Soviet and Belgian sides to overcome this barrier from the "cold war" era ended in failure.

But, thanks to the decisive turnabout in East-West relations which has finally led to an easing of the draconian Cocom measures, preparations for concluding the joint Soviet-Belgian project have accelerated considerably.

According to Belgian External Trade Minister Robert Urbain, the final obstacles to concluding the contract of the century have been removed. A few commercial and technical matters connected with forming the joint venture will be resolved in the near future, he said. R. Urbain believes that the contract could be signed 4-5 July this year in Moscow.

At the same time, the minister feels that a number of problems connected with the status of the Soviet-Belgian joint venture—which must be coordinated in detail with Soviet laws—are still unresolved. The coordination of financial problems is no less important. These are mainly caused by the delay in payment for a whole series of deliveries of Belgian goods to the USSR, primarily from metallurgical firms.

Despite the financial difficulties that have arisen recently in relations with the USSR, the BTM directors firmly intend to overcome them, especially as the contract of the century has been given priority support from the USSR State Planning Committee, as the Belgian press points out. Financial problems must not be an obstacle to the joint search for solutions, as a new Soviet-Belgian cotton project, to be implemented in Uzbekistan, is coming up.

Petrovskiy Talks With Belgian Ambassador on UN

PM2506114390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 20 June, V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, received L. Putman, Belgian ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request. Questions relating to the upcoming 45th session of the UN General Assembly session were discussed.

Finland's Nuclear Power Station Accident Examined

PM2606152390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Letter from O. Davydov, USSR deputy minister of foreign economic relations, under the general headline "International Departments' Mailbag": "Minimal Damage Caused"]

[Text] In connection with IZVESTIYA's publication of comments on the accident at the "Loviisa" nuclear electric power station, (issue No. 155), I should like to clarify the following point. On 28 May this year at the No. 1 unit of the "Loviisa" nuclear electric power station, a flowmeter flange coupling on a feedwater conduit of the station's No. 2 circuit ruptured. It should be explained that the station's No. 2 circuit consists of standard systems and equipment found at any traditional electric power station, while the radioactivity is contained entirely in the station's No. 1 circuit. The station's operational staff and automatic system worked efficiently and reliably, and the No. 1 power unit was soon shut down. As a result around 50 cubic meters of nonradioactive hot water escaped. None of the station staff was hurt and the damage to the system and structures in the rupture zone was minimal. After a thorough flaw-detection check of all analogous subassemblies, it was decided 29 May to shut down the "Loviisa" nuclear electric power station's No. 2 power unit as well for preventive maintenance of all similar flange couplings.

The rupture occurred in an element of the station's feed system designed and manufactured by Western firms and was not due to the quality of the ducts supplied to the "Loviisa" nuclear station from the Soviet Union. This is confirmed by specialists from the Finnish firm Imatran Voima, which runs the "Loviisa" nuclear power station, who expressed regret at press reports about the poor quality of the Soviet ducts, which is untrue. After repairs had been carried out and checked, the No. 2 power unit was restarted 6 June and the No. 1 unit on 8 June.

In the specialists' opinion, the accident has not undermined the "Loviisa" station's prestige as one of the world's most reliable nuclear power stations, a reputation largely due to the high quality of the Soviet equipment and the correctly chosen design solutions. I received confirmation of that during recent talks in Finland.

Eminent Finnish politicians and state figures believe, as the newspaper HELSINGIN SANOMAT reported 30 May last, that what happened at the "Loviisa" nuclear electric power station was quite unlike a nuclear accident and should not affect the prospects for the further development of the country's nuclear power industry. Plans to build a fifth nuclear power unit are primarily motivated by objective needs for a reliable and cheap energy supply as well by confidence in the nuclear power industry resulting from many years' successful experience of operating nuclear power stations in Finland, and by the attention paid to nuclear electric power station safety by Finnish state organs, power companies, and the public.

More on Finland's Suspension of Paper Deliveries

PM2706100190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by V. Shmyganovskiy: "Ultimatum From Finnish Firms. What Is Behind It? Paper Will Not Be Supplied"]

[Text] Helsinki—For the first time in Soviet-Finnish trading practice, the supply of newsprint to the USSR may be suspended. The reason is failure to meet the terms of payment.

"Finnpap" director general T. Nysten reported that if no payment is made in June for contracts that have already been fulfilled, the association, which represents the interests of nine paper factories, will stop dispatching their product to the customer.

At "Finnpap" I was told that no money has been paid paid for several months now. The debts now total almost 100 million markkas. At the same time, it was noted that there have been practically no delays in payment in bilateral clearing accounts. We are thus talking about that proportion of the paper that is supplied for convertible currency by agreement between the sides.

In one of his interviews with IZVESTIYA, T. Nysten said that last year, approximately one-fourth of the 412,000 tonnes of paper that we received was paid for, not on a clearing agreement basis, but with "hard cash." "Finnpap" increased supplies, responding to the "needs of glasnost," at the same time overcoming a great many hitches such as the lack of the requisite number of railcars and special warehouses on USSR territory, as well as chaos in the receipt of orders, and so on.

The irregularities in payments started earlier, but this year they have evidently become unbearable. As the HELSINGIN SANOMAT newspaper writes, Nysten said that his statement must not be seen as blackmail or some kind of threatening demand. "This is an appeal to the customer to clean up the payment situation," he says. "Official letters of notification have been sent to Soviet clients this week."

Whatever we may call it, an ultimatum is still an ultimatum. The Finnish press writes that the distribution of paper in the USSR is still in the hands of the central organs as before. They also control imports. In this connection, "Finnpap" appealed directly to the clients so that they could "exert pressure" on the Soviet authorities to put the situation right. Unusual? It certainly is!

Putting to the forefront of public life and into the press those questions, which had previously been resolved between the sides (behind the scenes), has provoked a varied reaction among businessmen in the sector.

People even phoned the IZVESTIYA correspondents' center from their cars, which were taking their owners out on St. John's Day, the country's most popular festival. Many people believe that the statement is quite sharp in its form, and unexpected. Such questions are best resolved confidentially, through negotiations. There can only be one justification: You cannot find people in the USSR at the moment whose promises you can trust. I was told of the following case: At a meeting with Finnish Prime Minister H. Holkeri in Leningrad, held at the end of May, one of the deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers promised that we will pay all our debts to our neighbors "in the next few days." Holkeri, naturally, immediately communicated this reassuring news to the Finnish press (it was a question of a sum of 300 million markkas.) A month has gone by, but nothing has been done.

It must be said that "Finnpap" supplies paper to over 100 countries in the world. The USSR accounts for 10 percent of its exports. The association's demand was put forward at a time when the paper situation on the world market is getting worse for all suppliers. Evidently, this has also had an effect on the adoption of the decision, because firms are experiencing difficulties with sales, and are in an acute need of resources.

The following detail became clear from the telephone calls to the correspondents' center: Our customers are refusing to pay fines for failure to make their payments on time. Meanwhile this measure has been adopted throughout the whole civilized commercial world. But why are world rules not binding on us?

Problems have long been accumulating in our mutual trade. IZVESTIYA has often written about this. The Finns became accustomed to the fact that no matter how difficult talks were in the past, there were never any problems with payments.

The truth must be seen: The transition to the market in our country promises even more confusion both for us and for the Finns. We are on the point of transferring from a buying and selling schedule drawn up at high state level, to ordinary, normal trade. Meanwhile, I will recall that Finland remains the only Western state with which we use a balanced accounting system for reciprocal deliveries. However, the transition to the market and the abandonment of the the clearing system, in the opinion of the majority of Finnish experts, cannot begin tomorrow, in a month, or in a year. The situation with "Finnpap" shows that this process will be long and painful.

Greek Consultations Held on Europe Security

LD2206000590 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 21 Jun 90

[Text] Athens June 21 TASS—The head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Y. Deryabin, and the director of a Greek Foreign Ministry Department, N. Bodaris, met here today.

They considered issues under discussion at the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Deryabin was also received by the secretary general of the Greek Foreign Ministry, P. Ekonomu.

Prunskiene Ends Visit With Greek Officials

LD2206012190 Moscow TASS in English 2120 GMT 21 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Sysoev]

[Text) Athens June 22 TASS—Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene ended on Thursday her private visit to Greece at the invitation of the newspaper KATHIMERINI.

Prunskiene held talks with Greek Deputy Prime Minister Tzannis Tzannetakis, Government Presidium Minister Miltiadis Evert, other members of the Cabinet and businessmen.

Summing up the results of her stay in the Greek capital, Prunskiene pointed out that the visit permitted to "make another step consolidating the reviving Lithuanian state" and became a starting point in the relationship between Lithuania and Greece. She stressed that such trips enable the new Lithuanian leadership to check its stand with the West's notion of whether Lithuania's steps towards gaining independence are "correct and effective," whether they fall in line with the processes taking place in Europe and the world in general.

Speaking about prospects of the solution of the problem of Lithuania's independence, Prunskiene pointed out that at present it is possible to state that a new stage in relations with the USSR has begun which is characterised by "the mutual desire of Moscow and Vilnius to remove tension in their relations and look for compromises, and the readiness to take into account various viewpoints and mutual interests". She expressed hope that the proposal of the Lithuanian Government on "freezing" the independence declaration of March 11 for a period of talks with the Soviet leadership would be approved by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

Ryzhkov Sends Condolences for Disaster in Turkey

LD2506193190 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 25 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov has sent a telegram to his Turkish counterpart Yildirim Akbulut, expressing sympathy for the national calamity in Turkey—strong mudflows, which resulted in the loss of life and destruction.

Ryzhkov also conveyed his sympathy to families of the dead and injured.

Political & Social

Gorbachev 'Trying To Clarify Attitude of Others'

AU2706085690 Paris AFP in English 0837 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Anne Penketh report]

[Text] Moscow, June 27 (AFP)—The crisis in the Soviet Communist Party deepened Wednesday as the policy-making central committee scheduled a meeting to discuss postponing a long-planned watershed party congress. A spokesman at Central Committee headquarters said a plenum would be held on Friday, with the congress currently scheduled to open only three days later.

Party radicals such as Russian President Boris Yeltsin back a proposal to postpone the congress, amid a sudden resurgence of conservative forces opposed to further democratisation and market-oriented reform proposed by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Radical Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak warned in an interview with French television Wednesday that holding the congress as planned "would mean the failure of the Gorbachev line".

The crisis between the party's reformist and conservative wings was highlighted at last week's congress of Russian communists, which saw the election of an orthodox hardliner as leader of the Russian party amid complaints that Mr. Gorbachev's policies were a betrayal of communism.

Party spokesman Aleksandr Lebedev told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE Wednesday that Mr. Gorbachev was "trying to clarify the attitude of others", ahead of the congress called to decide the party's future role and define further reforms. Mr. Lebedev, who said he was giving his personal opinion, admitted that Mr. Gorbachev had "underestimated the importance" of last week's Russian congress, widely seen as a dress rehearsal for the federal 28th congress. Asked whether Mr. Gorbachev was worried about the latest turn of events, Mr. Lebedev replied: "He can't stay indifferent. This concerns not just him, but his policy. He should be worried, and he is preparing himself quite vigorously" for the congress.

The spokesman denied that Mr. Gorbachev's prestige as party leader had suffered amid the crisis, and dismissed a suggestion that he had lost control. "He has a very high authority in party ranks," Mr. Lebedev said. He noted that the final say of whether to postpone the congress rested with the Central Committee, the sole body competent to change the date. Mr. Yeltsin on Tuesday predicted a "real fight" at the plenum, where conservatives numerically dominate.

Mr. Lebedev said that the idea of postponing the congress was "not brilliant", adding that he did not see what could be achieved. "If the reformers had a clear plan of action, it would be different," he said, noting that the party radicals were themselves divided over whether a postponement would serve their interests or play into the hands of the conservative faction by allowing more time to close ranks.

Mr. Sobchak Wednesday argued that holding the congress now would mean an even stronger showing by the conservatives than at last week's Russian meeting.

Party congresses are generally held every five years, but the 28th congress had already been brought forward from next year at Mr. Gorbachev's urging, to speed reform.

Mr. Yeltsin on Tuesday said that the congress was the ruling party's "last chance" for renewal, and warned of a party split without reform.

As preparations for the congress meanwhile continued with the date in the balance, the Communist Party daily PRAVDA on Wednesday published a draft platform to be adopted by the 5,000 delegates. The document notably sets out fundamental changes in party rules, rejecting the notion of democratic centralism under which the grass roots were obliged to follow decisions adopted by central party authorities. The party also favoured "competitive elections", and offered "alliances" with Socialist-oriented groups. The draft document, which attacks the polarisation in the conservative-reform debate, stresses that the communist party "is a party of socialist choice and communist perspective".

Medvedev Says Congress Will Start 2 July

AU2706121790 Paris AFP in English 1155 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 27 (AFP)—The 28th congress of the Soviet Communist Party will start Monday as scheduled, Vadim Medvedev, who is in charge of ideology in the Politburo, said here Wednesday.

"A vast majority of leaders of republican and regional organizations favour a congress at the date fixed," Mr. Medvedev said at a press conference.

Mr. Medvedev would not rule out that a plenary session of the central committee, or party "parliament", to convene here Friday to discuss congress procedures, might vote to postpone the congress. "On this occasion the date issue can still be raised", he said.

Party radicals such as Russian President Boris Yeltsin back a proposal to postpone the congress, amid a sudden resurgence of conservative forces opposed to further democratisation and market-oriented reforms proposed by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress

Delegates To Register 29 Jun

LD2706091890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] For the information of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress, the registration of congress delegates will be carried out on 29 June from 1000 to 2000 in the Georgiyevskiy Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace.

Medvedev Chairs Working Group

LD2606220190 Moscow TASS in English 1923 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—The working group of the commission to prepare the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress held a meeting here today. It was presided by Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Secretary Vadim Medvedev, who is also Politburo member.

They discussed amendments to the draft programme statement of the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress put forth at the constituent congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation.

Answering multiple addresses of communists, requests of the constituent congress of the Russian Communist Party and delegates of the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress, PRAVDA will publish the variant of the programme statement, prepared by the working group.

Komsomol Secretary Views

PM2606122590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 90 p 1

[Interview with Andrey Aleynikov, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, by I. Sichka under the "Topical Interview" rubric: "Our Position"—date and place of interview not stated; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] A Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee plenum is to be held 26 June to examine the question "On the position of the Komsomol Central Committee regarding the 28th CPSU Congress." Andrey Aleynikov, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, answers our correspondent's questions.

[Sichka] Andrey, does this agenda mean that differences of opinion have appeared in the stances of the "large" and "small" Central Committees?

[Aleynikov] I will not hide the fact that we have had certain vacillations in our discussion of the plenum agenda. On the one hand, do we have the right to get involved in purely intraparty affairs? And on the other, an organization that has stood close to the CPSU over a period of 70 years, that has been its "drive belt" and its "closest reserve," only declaring its independence after the 21st Komsomol Congress, cannot avoid expressing its attitude toward a congress that is the party's last chance for radical transformation. Our agenda should be seen as an attempt to show the party congress the possible paths toward the development of our union and toward a vision of the party's future and our relations with this party.

[Sichka] What stance is the Komsomol Central Committee Bureau adopting for the plenum, and how does it see the party's future?

[Aleynikov] The bureau will meet on the eve of the plenum, on 24 or 25 June. For the time being, I can only express my own opinion. I believe the CPSU has one choice: either to continue retouching its "facade" and thus inevitably find itself on the political margins, or else to radically examine its viewpoint of socialism and become the real political leader of society. At its congress the party simply does not have the right to delay the formation of a bloc of left-wing democratic forces. Otherwise we will see the coming together of extreme right-wingers and extreme left-wingers, from which only the "hard-liners" will gain. The CPSU must today become a party of civil accord, and find the courage to give up ideological disputes for a while and reflect on how to lead the country out of the crisis.

[Sichka] Today everyone is urging reforms in the party. The question is, what reforms exactly? For instance, should the character of the party change?

[Aleynikov] It seems to me that breaking lances over the terms "parliamentary" or "vanguard" is a fruitless scholastic argument. Any party in a democratic society strives for political leadership. And, by gaining victory at the elections and winning a majority in parliament, it will become the "vanguard." Therefore I do not see any reasons for argument here.

[Sichka] I see. And what about the demands for the depoliticization and de-ideologization of the state apparatus, the Army, the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and the KGB?

[Aleynikov] If the Decree on Power is passed in the same form as it was adopted as a principle by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies, then we will be forced to seek new ways to develop the Komsomol. After all, if the party committees withdraw from enterprises, this will automatically mean that Komsomol committees will also withdraw and the production-based principle of the Komsomol's structure will be eliminated. As far as the depoliticization of the army, the MVD, and the KGB is concerned, in a multiparty system political organs will simply not be able to exist within them and will be replaced sooner or later by other structures, with another function—a socioeducational function.

[Sichka] Who can enter the bloc of left-wing democratic forces that you mentioned?

[Aleynikov] Everyone, apart from the people who persistently reject the market and the need for political pluralism, or who insist on one party's monopoly on power and ideology. Even now there is really no point in talking to them. All the rest should, figuratively speaking, sit down at a "roundtable" and collectively seek ways out of the crisis.

Medvedev, Others Discuss Culture Policy

90UN2036A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 22, 2 Jun 90 pp 4-5

[G. Artashev and V. Potapov report on statements by V. Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Central Committee secretary, and others at the 21 May Moscow meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Commission: "Cultural Policy: Paths of Renewal"]

[Excerpts] **As has already been reported, a meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Commission chaired by V. Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, has taken place. The following took part in the discussion, which was devoted to topical issues of CPSU cultural policy in the era of perestroyka: N. Gubenko, USSR minister of culture; Academician D. Likhachev, chairman of the Board of the Soviet Cultural Foundation; G. Yagodin, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education; A. Belyayev, chief editor of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA; A. Kapto, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department; writer V. Rasputin, member of the Presidential Council; V. Kudryavtsev, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; V. Ugarov, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Academy of Arts; V. Zakharov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; O. Chernyshev and S. Shuvalov, deputy chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for the Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions, and Preservation of the Historical Legacy; V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Union of Writers Board; G. Seleznev, chief editor of UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA; A. Medvedev chief of the USSR Council of Ministers Culture and Public Education Department; T. Khrennikov, first secretary of the USSR Union of Composers Board; and V. Neroznak, doctor of philological sciences.**

We offer the reader an abridged version of the stenographic record of the meeting of the Ideological Commission.

Vadim Medvedev: The Relationship Between the Artist and Society Has Changed

The debate on questions of party cultural policy under present-day conditions is today acquiring a special meaning associated with the pre-congress debate that is taking place in the country. On the eve of the congress it is important to generalize the enormous experience that has been gained in this field during the years of perestroyka. Like the processes of cultural life, party cultural policy has undergone enormous changes.

This circumstance has been reflected in the memorandum prepared for today's meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Commission with the participation of commission members A.A. Belyayev, V.G. Zakharov, V.V. Karpov, and M.A. Ulyanov.

The first task for the party has been to unfetter and liberate creative thinking in the country and prompt free discussion of the problems that have built up in culture, provide space for progressive shifts in the public awareness, and create conditions for complete freedom of creativity. And it seems to me the changes in this field are great and obvious and should not be underestimated.

Of course, not everything here has yet been brought up to a level of democratization and glasnost that creates optimal conditions for creativity. There are still many administrative obstacles prejudices, and outdated habits. Freedom of creativity is restricted, unfortunately, by factionalism, intolerance, and egocentrism even in the milieu of the creative intelligentsia itself.

The transformation in culture, including in the activity of the creative intelligentsia, is also severely restricted by the material base and the shortages of paper and technical facilities. There is a lack, or at least in any case an extreme inadequacy, of legal regulators in this field. Nevertheless, there has been a major turn. The relationship between the artist and society, the artist and state, and the artist and the party has changed. Freedom of creative activity is to a greater degree being regulated not by orders but primarily by the moral and civic conscience of the artist. In this sense, party cultural policy has been of some consequence. But the processes in life are much richer than ever contemplated. They require generalization and intellection, for cultural policy should acquire wholeness and conceptual perfection

I think that the question of the relationship between ideology and culture is one of extraordinary importance. Culture without ideology cannot be. All of world history offers proof of this. But an ideology that sets itself above culture, when artistic creativity and its results are viewed through the prism of ideological stereotypes, ideology that is made into the fetters of culture, is baneful not only for culture but also for itself. And contrarily, when they offer mutual enrichment and are open to each other, the alternative of healthy relations between ideology and culture is seen in our society. But this alternative should not also entail ideological omninvorousness and lack of fastidiousness, or denial of the role of ideology in general. Truly scientific ideology is a system of coordinates drawn by the entire intellectual potential of a society. And it cannot be reduced merely to the statement of certain class commitments and assessments stemming from the nature of the social order. Ideology carries within itself a powerful stratum of common human values.

Earlier we often used to say over and over that our society had inherited the best humanistic traditions, that a person could not become a communist without having enriched his memory with the best of what mankind has achieved. But these propositions remained on the plane of general discussion. When it came to practical matters, common human values were criticized as "abstract humanism" and mercilessly destroyed. As if there were a strong divergence.

For us, of course, the central issue is the content and the methods used in CPSU activity in resolving the complex knot of problems facing culture, and the concept of cultural policy and the practical activity of the state, and of the activity of cultural organs, public organizations, and creative unions.

It is impossible not to notice that today's sociocultural situation is characterized not only by a considerable enlivening and enriching of society's spiritual life but also by various kinds of unfavorable trends, a decline in the cultural activity of some categories of the population, and the onslaught against young people by the so-called mass culture and its aggressive soullessness. It is obvious that these are negative processes that we do not have the right to disregard.

Nikolay Gubenko: Who Will Do This?

According to the figures from a poll of 36,000 people in the RSFSR, last year the greatest concern was elicited by the following: increased prices for goods and services, 80 percent [of those polled]; poor supplies of products, 84 percent; living conditions, 42 percent... At the same time the level of teaching in schools was a cause of concern for 8 percent of those polled, the insufficient number of cultural institutions—5 percent, the impossibility of acquiring essential literature also—8 percent, and the state of morals and morality—18 percent.

Does this mean that there is no demand for culture and education? No, it does not mean that. People have become tired. But the state should not allow itself to debilitate the people to the level of a number of mouths whose only desire is food, personal items, or sleep. To use the pretext of the circumstances that have taken shape in the economy means to promote the intellectual degradation of our nation, which is in 28th place in terms of level of education, and to reconcile ourselves to the fact that it is impossible to achieve a truly socialist ideal in the foreseeable future.

People lose heart when for the ninth time they are promised a bright future. They want to know what will happen next Monday or, say, after the party congress. And if next Monday what was promised comes to pass they will be on the side of those who did it. If the V.I. Lenin Library is made a lively place, if there is a museum of modern art, which we do not yet have in the country, if the Ministry of Defense vehicle base is removed from the Proviantskiy Depot and this unique cultural monument is used as it should be, people will be with those who did it.

All the depressing figures are known in the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers. Of the 172 major administrative territories in the country, only half of the autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts now have music theaters. Less than one-third have theaters for young theatergoers. By no means do all these territories even have puppet theaters. About 60 cities with populations greater than 100,000 have no theaters at all. Including the young (according to the makeup of the population) industrial centers. Something over half of the cities of this size have concert halls. In almost 90 administrative centers and cities with populations of more than 250,000 a person feels the lack of a museum of the arts!

The cost of the cultural program is known—R40 billion to R50 billion. The period for implementation is 10 years. Two five-year plans. Can this be allowed in the present situation? It can, if we do not build a plant that turns out to be unnecessary, if we do not sink billions into land reclamation. It is impossible to be a realist and not to understand that the Law on Pensions alone will require R46 billion.

In the USSR Ministry of Culture a strategy must be set for state domestic and foreign policy in the field of culture and the arts, multilateral interrepublic links, and so forth. For the all-Union ministry to be able really to influence artistic processes in the country, and cultural policy, it must have funding obtained from two main sources.

The first is assets from the all-Union budget transferred to the fund in accordance with the norms that have been set, as a percentage of the national income or the all-Union budget. The second is deductions from the profits of cost-accounting enterprises and associations that are owned by the state and subordinate to the USSR Ministry of Culture.

We need a law on culture in which quotas would be set for foreign artistic products, with a separate tax on them in order to protect the market, ethical, and moral standards, and the professional creative unions. The law should define guaranteed sources of funding for culture and the arts, protection of authors' rights to intellectual property, the protection of state, collective, and private artistic property, and guaranteed freedom of creativity. (But if this freedom just produces another burst of speculation on a certain theme, the only means of dealing with it can be competition in real art, which should enjoy all kinds of state encouragement in the form of subsidies. Otherwise the consumer will be dictating his own laws to us).

On the subject of monumental propaganda. The Soviet Leniniana occupies an important place in our monumental art. The monuments to Lenin built on USSR territory from 1924 to the present are numbered in the tens of thousands. This massive appeal of Lenin's personality to the masters (sometimes without the necessary cultural and professional training) has led to a sharp fall in the artistic level, large-scale duplication of stereotypical schemes, and the discrediting of the sociopolitical significance of the theme. During the last five years, monuments to Lenin of national importance built in response to decisions of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have been erected in Moscow, Frunze, Magadan, Arkhangelsk, Chita, Nukus, and Dzhezkazgan. The erection of such monuments is not limited to USSR territory. Memorials to Lenin have been set up in recent years in Havana, Hanoi, Copenhagen, and Delhi. In the years immediately ahead monuments to Lenin are to be built in Kaliningrad, Kostroma, Novokuznetsk, Bukhara, Tallinn, and Leninsk-Kuznetsk, and at the Sayano-Shushensky Regional Power Station. Even though, as it is we often have the curious situation in which several monuments are erected in the same city with limited space available.

The solution to this problem is seen primarily in sensible limitations on the number of such monuments. The final decision on the matter must nevertheless rest with the local soviets.

And on the subject of religion. Dialogue between the church and culture is vitally necessary both for the future of the church and for the prospects of culture. It is not at all happenstance, for example, that in 1982 the Pope in Rome established an Institute for Cultural Affairs in the Roman Curia.

No, it is not a question of delineating culture into lay and ecclesiastical, as some authors ask us to do in pieces that they publish, but, on the contrary, a question of what is needed for society's spiritual revival. The desire to please the spirit of the times is leading some people to the law of the pendulum: Now they take everything from the church, now they give it everything.

Gennadiy Yagodin: Moral Restraints Are Needed

The problems of culture lie in the sphere of ideology, in the sphere of education, and in the sphere of the arts. In this sense, de-ideologization of culture is impossible. It may be a question only of changes in ideological bases or the correction of ideological error. The main thing is to stop party leaders of all ranks from "controlling and directing cultural figures." Analysis, of course, is perhaps needed, but "prohibitions" and "prescriptions" are not possible.

For the people to perceive cultural works what is needed is not instructions but education! Education is the basis, the foundation of culture in the broad sense of the word. It is precisely here that cultural demands are shaped and the interested reader, listener, or viewer is nurtured. Policy in the field of culture should even begin not at school but in the family and in the kindergarten.

On the subject of freedom of creativity. I think that this is impossible without civic responsibility. Yes, the external restrictions have been lifted, but inner restraints—moral restraints—should be brought into play. Only five percent of our children are now taught in music schools. Given this, whom do we wish to see at symphony concerts? It is not a simple matter for a student to go to a show or concert, or even buy a newspaper. All education must be include the humanities, including technical education.

Albert Belyayev: A Sea of Resolutions. And the Result?

Of all the crises that our society is undergoing, in my opinion the most alarming is the crisis in the cultural sphere. Particularly the arts. There are many reasons for this.

Since April 1985 the party Central Committee has adopted about two dozen resolutions to improve conditions for creative labor and the material conditions for the existence of culture in general. Now, as is known, the party is transferring or has already transferred its administrative and managerial functions to the soviets, and the following question arises: What happens now with the purely administrative resolutions of the Central Committee that were hastily, but of course with the best of intentions, adopted during the first three or four years of perestroyka? Are they now binding on no one? No one has been in any hurry to implement these resolutions, and most of them have not been given financial or material underpinnings.

I do not intend to cite the figures for the excessive time taken to build cultural institutions—they are scandalous. And many of those that were planned have remained as Manilov "bridges"—they are neither projects nor allocated plots of land.

That is, we see a repeat of that gap between word and deed that has become chronic here and that we swore to abandon, as the hero from one of Boris Mozhayev's novels says, "once and for all." Yes, oaths are sworn but they do nothing but rend the air. The double-dyed residual principle triumphs and surveys with a grin all the fine, vain attempts by the authorities to change attitudes toward culture, liberate its forces, and open the road to initiative, philanthropy, and patronage of the arts.

However, we still entertain a disinterested attitude in society toward the noble concept of patronage of the arts. It is not encouraged as it should be, either through state taxation or through imbuing a deferential attitude toward it. The late Zilbershteyn donated a unique collection of paintings. He was followed by other contenders who gave in the hope that the Museum of Personal Collections would soon be opened. Zilbershteyn died and there is still no museum and the paintings are held in storage. What, then, is the incentive to make gifts?

The depressing lack of interest in the talent in our society must be cause for concern. In my opinion, today this is the chief ill in our cultural life. We have repeatedly written about this in our newspaper. The latest examples of this: Dmitriy Khvorostovskiy: they could find no place for him at the Bolshoy Theater, they could not find him a two-room apartment in Moscow, but to make up for this the best theaters in the world have opened their doors to him. Among us, Natalya Datsko from Lvov was wanted by no one, but Austria and Holland signed contracts with her and she is now singing successfully there. Natalya Troitskaya is now a prima donna with La Scala, the Vienna Opera, and the Metropolitan Opera, but we could find no place for her in a single opera or ballet theater! And what of the fate of the producer Vasilyev! He is already 50 years old. His talent is widely recognized. The theaters of Europe are very keen to have him. In his own motherland his fate was dismal: He had no theater of his own, and he got no help for his troupe of artistes, nor housing for them.

The minister and the ministry will do nothing unless they are supported by a broad public opinion and the efforts of the party and the new soviets. And on this plane I also stand for the need for a law on culture.

Dmitriy Likhachev: Take Counsel With Your Conscience

In the world of the 20th century aggressiveness has increased in an extraordinary way. In the most ordinary sense of the word. In particular, the forms in which the various new parties are emerging are aggressive... And even some of the speeches in the Congress of People's Deputies.

What is the reason for this? It is primarily that the humanities have been given a low priority. And the human brain is totally unadapted to solving exclusively technical tasks.

What is happening today in the West and in our country bears witness to the fact that the bent toward the humanities is nevertheless growing. Young people want to enroll in institutes of the humanities. This is a good sign. But you will agree that we pay very little attention to the "quiet youth" who occupies himself with culture, Latin, Greek, Church Slavonic... We must give serious consideration to providing support for this segment of our young people.

Our intelligentsia suffered great harm in the Civil War and during the years of dislocation and sweeping emigration. The great blockade of motherland and of Leningrad, and the Stalinist repressions destroyed the most unprotected segment of society—the intelligentsia... The already thin range of Russian life was made even thinner.

I am not happy when bad things are said about the so-called elitist nature of culture. The fact is that any culture must have its own elitist stratum. Dostoyevskiy, Pushkin, Turgenev—this was an elitist culture, and if we do not foster an elitist culture and encourage it, but create a certain system of suspiciousness toward it, then we shall thus be unable to raise the level of culture as such in our country.

Along with the development of the humanities it is essential to create a mass society of "classicists" so as to teach people to read the literary classics, listen to classical music, and take delight in classical paintings. You understand: The classics are necessary! And not just in some two or three schools in Moscow. We must have these kinds of societies throughout the country so as to oppose mass aggressive culture with real classical culture.

Pornography is only one side of the problem. The mass showings of corpses and murders that we see, for example, in our Leningrad "600 Seconds" shows.... People are becoming accustomed to murders, for them murder is becoming a everyday phenomenon. This is extremely dangerous.

The public must raise its voice against all kinds of aggressive appeals and insulting statements against particular peoples. If this occurs in the movies or on the television screen or in the newspapers, such productions and publications should simply be banned. There is no such thing as total freedom. Freedom should be limited by conscience. And sometimes, if you will, by the militia (when conscience is impotent).

The paper shortage. I understand that things are very bad with us. But where do the cooperatives obtain the paper for, for example, this same "Prostitute in Space"? And this at a time when subscribers to NOVYY MIR are simply being defrauded...

These things are totally impermissible. NASHE NASLEDIYE is being published in England, thank you Englishmen for saving our culture. But we cannot export the print runs that are printed there! The first issue is still there, and No. 3 has already been printed! And we pay money for nothing because the Soviet organizations that should be bringing our journals are taking hard currency from us from.. the Cultural Foundation! Well, tell me, please, why it is that in order to bring them from England using its own vehicles the Soviet motor transport organization must get hard currency from the Cultural Foundation? For the journal NASHE NASLEDIYE is very necessary. Yes, it is a journal of elitist culture but it should, I repeat, exist in every society for without it there would be no Dostoyevskiys or Pushkins or Mayakovskiys, and this means that we would not have even elementary cultured people.

Aleksandr Kapto: The Traffic Signal at Red

It is difficult to imagine work on a cultural policy and its implementation without real, thoughtful, consistent inclusion of science in the process. To the point, in our culture there is a remarkable tradition in this regard!

There is a complete lack of work in which attempts might be made to establish a conceptual definition of development in our artistic culture, or what contradictions might exist in the development and shaping of the individual's spiritual needs in this complex turning-point period.

A few words on the ethics of the creator. The ethical problems of the creative intelligentsia are acute and "neglected."

It is precisely here that I see shortcomings in the work of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department. We should be working more actively in this regard. But since we are having this meeting of the commission today and esteemed comrades are present I would like to draw attention to this problem.

There is more. Under the conditions of realization of the new political thinking, real conditions have emerged for a dialogue of the cultures. It is precisely now that it would be possible to expect that the reader and the viewer would be offered the best pictures, performances, and films... However, "mass" culture has been given the "green light." And what is really and truly of value is sitting in front of a red light...

Valentin Rasputin: In the Grip of the Interplay of Forces

We talk a great deal about priority attention to culture but we forget that this should not simply be one of the priorities but the main priority of state policy. It was said long ago that "man cannot live by bread alone..." Today, of course, there is no more important task than to feed the people. But why has this very task suddenly become so acute? Well, it is because both the wretched state of the economy and the depressing poverty in the social sphere are also the result of and a sign of the general lack of culture.

For many decades there has been no development of culture in our society; it has, one might say, simply been politicized, simply included in the defined frameworks that up to a certain time were suitable for the state. Thanks to this we have achieved a condition of society in which it is not even aware of its own cultural loss. At the USSR People's Deputies First Congress only D.S. Likhachev spoke about the cultural crisis, and, yes, the metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod. Well, perhaps a few other speakers mentioned the word "culture" in passing. Surely this is cause for concern?

I shall make no reference to the fact that a cultural crisis is being observed throughout the world. It is a cause for concern everywhere, and the civilized states are trying somehow to oppose these processes. Take Sweden, for example, where over the past five or six decades all attention has been focused on education, including for women. For it is very important that a woman be educated, that she be a bearer of the culture; this is the best guarantee for preserving and developing a national culture. It is perhaps not too late for us to make use of that experience. In any event, why not try?

Of course, in and of itself education is not a panacea. It is quite possible for it to become a tool in the shaping of the individual according to a definite stereotype—often a political stereotype or even a stereotype of conjuncture. But culture—this is nevertheless, along with enlightenment, when the personality is illuminated in a humanitarian way by adopting common human values. What we need now precisely is enlightenment, but our school programs on that great humanist Dostoyevskiy now last no longer than six hours.

I do not believe overmuch in laws. Now people say this: We need a law on morals, we need a law on culture... This immediately leads me to think about Baykal: The more resolutions "on Baykal" that were passed the worse the situation became. It has been known for a long time that if you want to destroy something then pass a resolution or law on it. None of our laws works. And a law on culture will not work, especially now, at this time of transition. Perhaps there is no need for us to fear the words "moral censorship?" It seems to me, for example, that at least during the period that no law is in operation moral censorship is needed, otherwise we shall be unable to cope with the flood of mass culture. For today the public atmosphere is indulgent toward it, I would even say patronizingly indulgent. This public attitude is already becoming a public terror with respect to morality, with respect to the chastity of the arts. And here, the mass media are doing their black business.

Cost-accounting relations for the theater and for publishing houses now, on the eve of the free market, constitute yet another fatal blow to culture. How can true art and true literature survive when a performance or a book becomes a commodity? Who will present a performance or publish a book under the threat of financial loss? Very few still, and we shall remember with yearning the times of stagnation when a book was not a commodity and when because of that not only "suitable" works but works that were simply good and necessary for society were being published. Today the state must take under its patronage and finance at least some of its publishing houses so that they can publish "noncommercial" literature. It is essential to devise a mechanism to protect culture against commercialization.

And finally, my last point. The church here is separate from the state, but today, as we make everything our business, we are trying through our common efforts to revive morality in society, to revive spiritual values. This is remarkable, and it is also remarkable that the churches have started to return their sacred things. In my opinion there can be no disputes here about ownership. But in exactly the same way there can be no disputes about who should own these sacred things. Today we are ready to offer them for sale, as, for example, the Yermomolova Theater in Moscow, which is about to be made into a cultural entertainment center.

One month ago a library in Irkutsk was literally razed because there was no money for repairs. Even the books were not saved because the four stories were demolished. Why are we today continuing to destroy what has been preserved? [passage omitted]

Vadim Medvedev: Not Declarations But Real Things

I do not lay claim to presenting a summation of our debate. I would simply like to offer a few ideas. I would like to support what we have started today, that which has been voiced so sharply in the statements from Nikolay Nikolayevich Gubenko, Albert Andreyevich Belyayev, and Vladimir Vasilyevich Karpov. In fact it is essential that the real change in attitudes toward culture should not be just declarative but should also acquire real features and be reflected in the documents of the 28th CPSU Congress. This applies first and foremost to appropriations for development in the cultural sphere, and for material-technical resources. Here I agree with the very keen presentation of the matter. Attitudes toward culture are not only an indicator of a society's degree of civilization but also an essential condition for transformations in the economy, in science, and in politics. According to Lenin, it is precisely the cultural preconditions that were decisive for our country's transition to socialism. And today this proposition is just as valid.

A figure of R40 billion has been quoted for appropriations. But it is not even a question of figures, even though that amount might be inadequate. What is needed is for each one of us in his own sector to fight for the interests and the priority of the spheres of culture, education, and science. And in practical legislative activity, when the budget is being approved, and in discussion in party organs at all levels. It is necessary to mobilize the public so that people who proclaim the right principles are able to defend the interests of culture. For in the grand reckoning, they are the interests of the country.

The problems of culture are actualized especially in connection with the switch to regulated market relations. There will be a temptation to limit appropriations and make cultural concerns a second priority. So we must work to create protective mechanisms not only for the individual and his well-being but also for culture. It seems to me that it would be worthwhile for the leaders of our cultural departments, together with the Academy of Sciences and our jurists, to start work on the kind of protective mechanism that would protect culture against economic stresses. And it is important not to lose time.

I think that it is essential to place all other resources in the service of culture and education, and as you know, these are enormous. I have just visited Vitebsk Oblast. At every two or three kolkhozes [collective farms] outpatient departments and polyclinics have been built and equipped fairly well. There is a secondary school at almost every kolkhoz. There are houses of culture... And most of this has been done without using centralized funds. There are music schools in the rayon centers. And in Vitebsk one would not take umbrage at the cultural institutions. They have not yet been able to solve the problem of the Chagall Museum. The people in Vitebsk need help.

But there are enormous opportunities at the local level. The various farm leaders understand the role of the human factor and will never abandon their role of generous sponsors. Of course, it is not usual to call a kolkhoz chairman a sponsor, but this is what it amounts to... Wherever an understanding of the importance of the problem is to be seen, much can be done apart from the state budget.

I would also support what has been said here about the need to develop patronage of the arts, in the fine sense of the word. This could become a help for state policy and state budget allocations.

Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev and Valentin Grigoryevich Rasputin have developed the thesis of humanizing all aspects of our live^. And first and foremost the humanization of the sphere of culture and education itself. And the humanization of biology and mathematics are also important. But if less attention is paid to Dostoyevskiy than to anthropology then this is simply a paradox. We are making children cram mechanically. Just look at how grammar is taught. They learn complex linguistic terms by rote and soon forget them, and alas! they do not to learn write competently. Logic must be developed, and thinking, culture, and in-depth understanding too. But what is poured down on children often merely instills in them an aversion to their own native tongue, to literature, if you will.

Appreciation of the humanities must begin in people themselves. By our own example we must also attract our technocrats and our economists so that they do not forget about the human measure of any business undertaken.

There has also been talk here of assessing our past and the complex peripeteia in our party's cultural policy, and its dramatic history. Today we cannot avoid principled assessments of the past. And they must be presented in our document, so that the position is clear. I should say that the process of dealing with the stereotypes of the past is by no means complete. And not only in the mass consciousness but also in the theoretical consciousness. Someone here reminded us of the formula "culture national in form but socialist in content." Armed with such cliches, that is how they led at one time, failing to notice the vulgarized meaning of this formula. The national form of a culture, of course, is not amenable to doubt. However, this formula as it were excludes the mutual enrichment of the nation and of national cultures. With respect to the second part, it virtually discards common human values. But is culture conceivable without them? The time has come for our theoreticians and cultural experts and commentators to come to grips with the stereotypes that have become so deeply ingrained in the consciousness. I often catch myself thinking that we have been perceiving both Lenin and our own basic values, both theoretical and ideological, through the prism of the latest interpretations. And we are far from having freed ourselves of them.

The problem of the interaction of ideology and culture is very complex. In my opinion, the demand to de-ideologize culture should not be accepted uncritically. In general it has not yet been decided whether or not culture should be freed from ideology. It is evidently another issue, namely, that cultural values and the results of artistic creativity should not be replaced by purely ideologized criteria, and that what should be borne in mind primarily is the common human nature of their importance and the requirements of the individual and of society as a whole.

We also observe something else. Under the slogan of de-ideologization of culture attempts are often made to simply replace one ideology with another. Under the flag of criticism of ideologization and extreme ideologization some strata of culture are thrown overboard and consigned to oblivion, while it is proposed that they be replaced by other strata that are in no way de- ideologized but on the contrary have a different political sign.

And finally, the negative trends in mass culture, which contain within themselves a retreat from high moral and ethical criteria. Clarity and exactitude of assessment are also needed here. It is also worth thinking about legislative mechanisms to monitor observance of basic moral standards.

Minister N.. Gubenko said that a concept is being prepared for legislation in the field of culture. I think that we should not abandon this, come what may. But this should not simply be declarations but full-fledged laws that provide mechanisms for their implementation. And where possible something must be done right now, relying on the present legislative base. We must act vigorously. Perhaps within the framework of the Central Committee Ideological Commission we could set up a working group to systematize all the proposals. And to clarify what must be resolved legislatively and where mechanisms should be switched in. How should the soviet organs and the party organizations at the local level be oriented? It is important that here too our party occupy firm, progressive, democracy positions. But at the same time clear attitudes with respect to ideology and esthetics.

We must think: Perhaps we can come up with a proposal for the congress to adopt a special document—a 28th CPSU Congress resolution on the new party policy in the field of culture.

The Ideological Commission decided the following:

—to pass material taking into account the debate at the meeting, to working groups and to the commission preparing draft documents for the 28th CPSU Congress;

—to submit to the CPSU Central Committee a proposal on preparing a 28th CPSU Congress draft resolution on a new party cultural policy;

—to assign a group of commission members to draw up proposals for the USSR Supreme Soviet on the question of legislation in the field of culture;

—to prepare proposals on matters pertaining to monuments to V.I. Lenin and ideological-political aspects of toponymy.

KGB Chairman Kryuchkov Interviewed

PM2106132790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed interview with V.A. Kryuchkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR KGB, under the rubric "Word Before 28th CPSU Congress: "Justifying the People's Trust"]

[Text] Question: Vladimir Aleksandrovich, as a CPSU Central Committee Politburo member what questions are you engaged in?

Answer: I would like to note that the Politburo is a collective party organ in which the members' curatorship of individual avenues is not clearly defined. It is one of the ways in which the Politburo differs from the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat. As a Politburo member I deal to some extent or other with all questions discussed at its sessions.

In recent years substantial changes have taken place in the activity of the party Central Committee and its Politburo. As a result the degree of participation of Central Committee members in party affairs has increased markedly. I regard work directly in the party organizations and with communists as important to myself.

In the Central Committee a number of commissions have been formed headed by Politburo members and CPSU Central Committee secretaries. I take an active part in several of them. They are the Central Committee Commission for questions of international politics and the Central Committee Politburo commissions for questions of interethnic relations and for the additional study of materials connected with the repressions of the thirties and forties and early fifties. I should like to recall that I belong to the Defense Council and the Constitutional Commission and since March 1990 I have been a member of the Presidential Council. As you can see there are quite a few commissions in which I work. In addition I take what is, believe me, a far from formal part in the examination of specific issues of a current nature. I do not say this to stress what a large number of commissions I work in but so that you can understand that order needs to be introduced in this question and a more thorough approach needs to be displayed toward the creation of commissions and groups and the determination of their composition. I think that all this serves primarily the cause of the party's renewal and the improvement of the work of its leading organs and the style and essence of their activity.

Question: Have there been cases when you have had to resolve some questions not as chairman of the USSR KGB but as a party figure?

Answer: To give you the facts: I was elected a member of the party Central Committee at the 27th CPSU Congress and I have been KGB chairman for about two years and a Politburo member for less than a year.

As a member of the Central Committee and the Politburo I have, without exaggeration, received quite a few specific missions. Recently I have taken part in the search for solutions to problems in the field of interethnic relations. This has become one of the most acute avenues in the life of society and the state and the fate of our Union, the fate of each people, in whatever republic or oblast they may live, will depend largely on how we act and on which principled approaches we adhere to. In resolving problems we are often late, are afraid to look truth in the eyes, do not rely enough on political and public forces representing a specific national formation, and do not know how to seek compromises. On the other hand—I should like to stress this particularly—we display lack of resolve when we encounter violent, criminal actions by extremists for whom political ambitions and careerist goals come before all else. In the struggle for power they scorn nothing and when political means are exhausted violence should be halted by force.

I am taking part in the settlement of the situation around the Republic of Afghanistan. One of our policy's biggest achievements was the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet troops from that country. I am convinced that Soviet-Afghan relations can be built on a basis of friendship and cooperation, for the benefit of both peoples, because the Soviet Union and Afghanistan are both interested in this. Look at the history of relations between these countries, at the geographical map, at the coincidence of our national interests—and the importance of this problem will become clear. Of course, we must consider the existence of directly opposite sociopolitical systems and our two countries' important peculiarities.

I consider it important to take part in work on problems of arms reduction, perestroyka in foreign economic activity, the conversion of the defense sectors of industry, and the struggle against crime in our country.

I often address various audiences. These meetings provide much that is useful and bring me satisfaction. I particularly value the questions and debates which arise at these times. Every meeting is enriching and, most important, helps me to acquire a better understanding of what is taking place in our country and to feel people's moods more keenly.

Soon after my election as a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo I was instructed to deliver the report on the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. I gave a great deal of effort to work on the report and tried to cover questions and approaches toward them from principled positions.

Question: In your view, what are the features of the country's situation and the atmosphere in the party on the eve of the 28th CPSU Congress?

Answer: Life today is so complex and multifaceted that answers to the challenge of the times can only be given by the collective intelligence of the entire party and entire people. In this connection I pin great hopes on the 28th CPSU Congress. I should like to voice a few personal opinions on this score. I believe that the situation in the country is exceptionally difficult. Events are developing acutely and unpredictably according to variants which are utterly unwanted for us.

Yes, perestroyka is a historical necessity, it is natural, but by virtue of objective and subjective reasons it has to blaze a trail for itself in a close intermingling of positive and negative manifestations. Objectively this depends on the low point to which we had descended in previous decades while subjectively far from everyone is acting constructively, and in some respects we have miscalculated and made mistakes. A big undertaking like the fundamental perestroyka of our political, economic, and legal systems cannot proceed more rapidly than is dictated by the conditions—not only internal but also external—which have taken shape. It is no accident that many projected deadlines have run aground and remained only on paper. Lenin's genius tell us that a Marxist must consider the realities of life and the precise facts of reality. And that is what we still lack.

We have taken radical steps along the path of the development of democracy and glasnost. Without that we cannot insure headway, we cannot set in motion Soviet people's entire intellectual potential and enormous possibilities. But we can ruin both democracy and glasnost and turn them into a laughing-stock, an object of derision, if there is no law and order in the country, no respect for the law, no observance, by all members of society, of the norms regulating their relations. In our country on the one hand there is no legislation according with the present stage of Soviet society's development. The legal foundation is only being formed and here the USSR Supreme Soviet has undeniably done a great deal of work. On the other hand, there is no obedience to the law, and this is leading to the point where the lack of discipline, civic irresponsibility, and permissiveness are beginning to have an extremely adverse effect. As a result both people and the state as a whole are suffering.

I am convinced that, in developing democracy and glasnost, we must strengthen law and order in the country by every means. Both should lie at the foundation of the consolidation of all truly democratic forces and the strengthening of Soviet statehood.

We should not be surprised that criticism has lashed all avenues of our social life. For too long we kept quiet, tolerated the far from brilliant state of affairs, and nonetheless I think that the constructive aspect in our society's transformation is gathering momentum at an absolutely inadequate rate.

In society now people are perhaps talking most about the party. Of itself this fact confirms the party's importance for Soviet people's lives. I have been in the party for nearly 50 years now, and as a communist I shall not conceal the fact that it is painful to hear the indiscriminate attacks on the CPSU. Demands that it be put on trial are even being heard. There is plenty of everything here—lack of objectivity and perhaps lack of understanding—but there is also a blatant design.

The party has been and remains the most powerful force in Soviet society. The CPSU is being renewed and is seeking as far as it can to renew society. Figuratively speaking it is on the march. The process of renewal has not yet reached its apogee. The truthfulness with which the party speaks of its past and present errors and blunders lends it strength and helps to strengthen its influence but at the same time it also makes it vulnerable. You can hear opinions to the effect: But look what the communists themselves are saying about themselves. I think that under these conditions we must continue to proceed in party life along the path of truth but at the same time firmly defend the party's revolutionary history and present and future. We have cause to be proud and we should not rush from one extreme to the other: Quite recently everything the party did was good and now almost everything it does is bad. Here sober-minded forces should have their say. Incidentally, our opponents have far from strong positions and often, losing all measure and responsibility, they construct criticism against the party on unfounded inferences, often on direct slander. And the main thing is that they offer virtually nothing in exchange.

The Russian Communist Party is being born before our eyes. On this score the communists and all Soviet people have done a lot of thinking and there have been both emotional and rational elements in their approaches toward this problem. I am deeply convinced that the Russian communists, having created their own party, will display the greatest concern for our union. There can be no greatness for Russia without greatness for the Union. That is borne out by our entire history in both the remote and the recent past.

And one more wish. I should like to hope that after the 28th party congress we will proceed along the path of reducing the number of congresses, conferences, meetings, gatherings, and other similar events. Their number has simply become a sign of the moment in which we are living.

Question: The process of creating new parties is under way in the country. How do you see the role of the CPSU under the conditions of the multiparty system and how do you envisage your participation in party life?

Answer: An important element of the country's political life has become a phenomenon to which we had grown unaccustomed—the emergence in the arena of political and social forces including those whose orientation is not always obvious. I think that not everyone has yet understood that the multiparty system has ceased to be a theoretical abstraction for the country. No law on parties and public organizations has yet been adopted yet many groups, trends, unions, and so forth are already operating in the vortex of events. Much, however, is not being done according to classic yardsticks. The lack of political culture and experience has obviously been felt by everyone. Among the broad spectrum of demands and claims to political primacy there has been much that it is artificial, that reflects neither the requirement of the time nor the interests of our society's social strata. Just think, for instance, about cases of the proclamation of parties of monarchists, anarchosyndicalists, simple anarchists, constitutional democrats, socialist revolutionaries, or supporters of the union of the Archangel Michael!

A realistic politician cannot fail to understand that the world has greatly changed, that life has gone far ahead. And to repeat history is to doom not only ourselves but also those whom we are calling to follow us to the bitterness of disillusionment and the futile expenditure of effort. There is already confirmation of that, despite our only brief experience of the multiparty system. The attempt to exploit the crisis phenomena in the economy, the desire to earn political clout exclusively from positions of confrontation with the CPSU have led some sociopolitical organizations to rally on a strictly anticommunist basis.

In this connection I should like to say the following. The centuries-old experience of many states has forged a rule which we should also heed: If a country wants to avoid plunging itself into the chaos of fratricidal war and intends to build its prosperity within the framework of its chosen sociopolitical system, it cannot allow the activity of political parties and groups acting from anticonstitutional positions. The establishment of a multiparty system cannot be allowed to aggravate the situation in the country still further. Responsibility for this rests with each participant in the political process.

The CPSU must learn to live under the conditions of the multiparty system. All members of our party should possess this skill. We have grown unaccustomed to the classic forms of political struggle because the provisions enshrined in the Constitution regarding the party's leading role automatically turned party instructions into norms and since that was so what struggle could there be? I am deeply convinced that the CPSU will find the strength in itself and by its daily work on a broad front, constantly among people, in the thick of events, will ensure its position as the vanguard force in society. It is very important that young, fresh forces from among the workers, peasants,and intelligentsia should flow constantly into our ranks, and that they should feel the need to be in a party environment where everything can be said openly, where any question can be discussed, and where they can be confident that that a constructive thought will meet with support.

Question: We are creating a rule-of-law state. There have been many rebukes relating to the Chekists' work. They have been accused of violations of the law and of repressions. What is being done to ensure that the past is not repeated?

Answer: The history of the state security organs is as diverse and contradictory as the history of the Soviet state and society. Sources of lawlessness were general and the reasons and circumstances which gave rise to them were characteristic of our entire country. There are also bright pages in the history of the state security organs. There is much that is glorious and heroic in this history. The period of the thirties and forties and early fifties was difficult. At that time there were mass repressions in our country. Various figures have been cited in the press on this score. I should like once again to cite the precise figures: During those years 3,778,234 people were subjected to repressions. The years 1937-1938 were hellish. The victims included tens of thousands of staffers of the state security organs. In brief, everyone was affected.

A principled assessment has been given of the crimes which were committed and an enormous amount of work is now being done to restore the good name of the innocent who suffered. The KGB and its local organs are taking a most active part in this work. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet people have had their good name returned to them. Our position is to conceal nothing, otherwise the process of self-purging, the process of drawing lessons from the tragic past would be incomplete.

Much is being done and has already been done to ensure that the past is not repeated. First of all the legal basis is being strengthened and a strict legal framework is being wet for the activity of the state security organs. Reliable levers have been created for state and legal control over the activity of the KGB on the part of the USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet, its committee for questions of defense and state security, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the prosecutor's office organs. The broad glasnost which the state security organs enjoy is making it possible to ensure the public's participation in the mechanism of control too. But I must say that so far, unfortunately, there is now main legal act—a law on the KGB. As of today the draft of this law has been discussed in a number of USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions and we hope it will be adopted for examination at the next session this fall. This will be the first public law strictly defending the rights, duties, and framework of activity of the KGB organs and troops.

We heed attentively what is being written in the mass media about the work of the state security organs and we are trying to consider critically everything addressed to us. We understand glasnost primarily as a rich opportunity for consulting with the public. The chekists' ties with the labor collectives have never been so broad. But we believe this is only the beginning.

Question: And now about how perestroyka is proceeding in the KGB. What is its essence?

Answer: Perestroyka is being carried out in the KGB and it is proceeding very actively. It has affected the structure of the subunits and virtually all avenues of operational activity. There has been a drastic reduction in the volume of work on some sectors and new spheres of activity have emerged. The mechanism for joint actions with other law enforcement institutions are undergoing changes.

The KGB organs are not some autonomous field, they are an organic part of the state mechanism and under the conditions of perestroyka cannot undergo only cosmetic changes.

Criminal legislation is being changed. For instance, formerly anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda constituted a crime. Now, unless they are of the nature of calls for the violent overthrow of the authorities, they no longer come under the heading of crime.

We have ceased to vet Soviet citizens leaving for brief business trips abroad. After all, there are now millions of them. Actually, even before this vetting was of a restricted, special-purpose nature.

Complex processes are under way in the country and it is not always possible to determine immediately the nature of the events as they develop. Analysis, including long-term analysis, is needed. That is why special attention is being paid to the improvement of the information analysis service.

Never before have we encountered such large scales in conflicts emerging on an interethnic basis. In accordance with this we are restructuring the work of the state security organs in the center and locally. Incidentally, we are resolving the question of the broader enlistment of representatives of the most diverse nationalities to work in the KGB.

The expansion of the powers of the local organs of power has led to the need to expand the framework of the tasks which the state security organs resolve locally. We have been required to make far greater efforts in the struggle against smuggling, narco-business, and organized crime. Crime, particularly organized crime, has a direct bearing on state security inasmuch as it has an adverse effect on the situation in entire regions, depriving Soviet people of the opportunity to live and work peacefully.

A fundamentally new factor for us is the expansion of the foreign ties of departments, enterprises, and scientific institutions with their partners abroad. This channel can be used for illegal actions and operations detrimental to our country's economy. It is also important that it should not be used for the enrichment of individual corrupt people. Deals have already been intercepted, making it possible to avoid losses to our state running into many millions. A considerable quantity of money and valuables has been confiscated.

In our work we count on the active aid and assistance of the Soviet public and mass media. State security is a broad concept. It involves an enormous range of tasks and the law enforcement organs alone cannot resolve them.

I should like to mention in particular the guarding of the state border. A fundamentally new situation has recently formed on the border, or to be more precise on significant sectors of the border. For a long time our border was crossed illegally by something in the order of 2,000 people every year, mostly entering the Soviet Union. That was dangerous, because the violators often came to us with evil intent. In the past two to three years there have been mass crossings of the border in both directions involving tens or tens of thousands of people either on the spur of the moment or with the permission of the authorities. We were not ready for this situation. To this we must add the tasks which have arisen in protecting the economic zone in the regions of the Soviet Union's state borders. All this has led us to the need to elaborate a new doctrine for protecting the border and we think that before the end of the year we will present the draft of this doctrine to the USSR president for examination.

So perestroyka is proceeding among us. Not everything is succeeding. For many questions we have not yet found formulas. But were made confident by the fact that the perestroyka process is of a collective nature and everyone—from rank and file staffer to leader—is taking part in it. We are grateful for any opinions and advice reaching us from outside.

Question: And finally one last question. What are the role and tasks of Soviet intelligence under present conditions, in a period when fundamental changes are taking place in the international situation?

Answer: At first glance it may perhaps seem strange, but I would say the intelligence services' activity and the problem of trust in the world are directly dependent on each other. It should be noted with satisfaction that in recent years the degree of trust in relations between states has increased. After a while this may become a steady trend. But the difference in national interests (I would particularly highlight that), the burden of the past, the actions of the most extreme forces, and the unpredictability in the development of the situation in individual regions of the globe are forcing the opposing sides not to content themselves with official assurances but somehow to reinforce them with reliable information, which is often not on the surface. In big politics you must act without taking risks and at any rate be convinced that particular steps by the other side do not contain any dirty tricks.

In the developed capitalist countries the military-industrial complex operates actively, work is under way on new types of weapons, and military tactics and strategy are being rehearsed. In brief, what we are talking about is how although the process of the reduction of the material base of war has emerged it has not reached a level when it may confidently be said that the world has been saved from the dangers of military conflicts.

Today there is no other, more effective, means of obtaining reliable information on these and other questions except for intelligence. So that there is work for the intelligence service, and this must be taken into account. Soviet intelligence is constantly engaged in the analysis and modeling of the prospects for the development of world problems but now I think this avenue is acquiring particular importance, especially as intelligence has the opportunity to pool secret and open information. And, returning to the start of my answer to your question, I should like to say that our intelligence service, by obtaining warning information and ascertaining in good time the start of the development of negative events and especially trends, can render inestimable assistance in forming the optimum policy.

Within the framework of our talk I should like to say a few words about PRAVDA. This is the press organ which my parents read, it is the newspaper with whom I have been acquainted the longest. For many decades I did not miss a single issue of the newspaper. I think the newspaper will live forever if its content accords with its name. In recent months the newspaper has changed out of all recognition. The content has changed, and boldness and freeness and much food for thought have appeared in the items it publishes. PRAVDA seeks answers to questions together with its readers and it seems to me that is very important. There is a rich aktiv of readers and many interesting new names have appeared. The search for the truth is the reason for the newspaper's publication of items by authors standing on different positions. The content has blazed a trail to new forms, the newspaper has begun to be published with an effective form. The main thing is that it is a respectable, truthful newspaper which inclines people toward work and creation.

Former KGB General Kalugin Discusses Speech

LD2406163190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2040 GMT 23 Jun 90

[Interview with retired KGB General Oleg Danilovich Kalugin by announcer V. Molchanov, from the "Before and After Midnight" program—live]

[Text] [Molchanov] We have in front of us something of a rarity. KGB General Oleg Danilovich Kalugin, after making a brilliant career, according to the rumors—though rumors from quite competent sources—and despite being far from old, suddenly retired in March. A week ago, Gen. Kalugin made the first public statement in his life during the All-Union Conference of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU.

Oleg Danilovich, your speech caused a sensation at the time; are you not putting yourself or your relatives at any risk by appearing on this program.

[Kalugin] Well, I think there are various dirty tricks one can expect from my former organization. At the same time, I am psychologically prepared for any turn of events. Besides, I have not yet exhausted my potential as regards disclosing many aspects of the KGB's activities which, in my view, pose a threat to the democratic processes in society. At the same time, what perhaps gives me far greater joy, and unexpected joy as well, is the support I have been given from colleagues still working in the KGB. They have met with me since my statement, and said they agree with the stance I have taken and with the criticism I made public during the conference.

[Molchanov] Oleg Danilovich, you are a professional. Your whole life has been bound up with the activities of the special services, and not only with the Soviet ones, but as far as I know, with foreign ones as well. Do you know what hatred is, and have you ever come up against hatred toward yourself?

[Kalugin] I have perhaps not yet experienced hatred in the direct sense, though I can imagine, naturally, that I was hated by a certain section of the public, especially in the KGB bodies, in the KGB leadership. And I ought to say, one might say, they started this when I became a general at the age of 40, which did not arouse great enthusiasm among those around me either, as it was rather unusual for a relatively young KGB official to become a general at that age. So even then I experienced certain signs of hostility, and even attempts to find something or someone behind me that made it possible for me to take up quite a high-ranking intelligence job at the time, and consequently acquire a high military rank.

[Molchanov] Oleg Danilovich, following your statement about the overall numerical strength of the KGB exceeding that of the special services of Europe, America, and Asia together, not counting China, and about the security bodies posing a threat today to the democratization of our society, are you not afraid that your former colleagues will regard you...[changes thought] will punish you in some way?

[Kalugin] I agree this is possible, and I said at the very beginning that I am prepared for any turn of events, psychologically as well.. As far as the numerical strength is concerned, since we are on the subject, I did indeed make an overall assessment of the present cadre numbers of the KGB. I said that I do not know about China—but incidentally, in this connection I remembered that the Chinese Army is half the size of the Soviet Army, so it is possible that I could have included China, too, in my list of continents and countries. But I would like to take this opportunity to make an even more precise statement on this subject, one which might come as a surprise to the viewers. It might make a more convincing impact than what I said before: The numerical strength of the central apparatu of the KGB today is far in excess of the strength of the CIA and FBI together—that is, of the main intelligence and counter-intelligence services in the United States.

[Molchanov] I do not want to ask you any questions that might cause harm to you or to what you have been defending all your life—state security—but still, if possible, could you tell us about your past work?

[Kalugin] I rose from the rank of lieutenant to general. I began in intelligence and ended up in counterintelligence. My last intelligence job, that is, in the First Directorate of the KGB, was head of external counterintelligence. In internal counterintelligence, my last job was first deputy head of the Leningrad KGB Directorate. I was then moved to the KGB reserve, and used in departments engaged in protecting state and defense secrets.

[Molchanov] You worked in intelligence for a long time. How serious was the loss caused to our intelligence service by the defection of, let us say, Gordiyevskiy in London, or other traitors?

[Kalugin] The damage was enormous. First, Gordiyevskiy was just one of many, though he was a fairly high-ranking KGB official. It is interesting, by the way, that he was once the assistant of one of the current leaders of the KGB. The thing is that apart from Gordiyevskiy, there have been quite a few traitors who either betrayed their country while serving abroad or else became traitors within the country and worked for U.S. and certain other intelligence bodies. In my view, the aura of mystery and secrecy in which the KGB clothes itself is mainly aimed at the domestic population, since abroad very many of the KGB's secrets have been known for a long time and one can read about them in newspapers and find them in any of the publications...

[Molchanov, interrupting] And Barron's books.

[Kalugin] If only in Barron's book, though it falls far short of giving a full and perhaps always accurate picture of the KGB in its present form. Nonetheless, there is more than enough material on the subject, but the Soviet public, unfortunately, knows very little and it is from them, incidentally, that many blunders and flops in intelligence and counterintelligence activities are being hidden.

[Molchanov] If you continued to work in the KGB today and were given some opportunities, what would you change in the activities of the state security bodies?

[Kalugin] Well, the first thing I would do is to remove the KGB from the command of the party, any kind of party, whether communist or any other. The word departization has now come into usage; if I may be allowed to use a neologism, I would say de-politization is definitely needed. Those structures within the KGB engaged in political investigation, and that prepare and disseminate disinformation both inside and outside the country, must be disbanded. The intelligence service must be removed from the KGB apparatus and made subordinate to the president or to the Council of Ministers; at any rate it must be removed from the aegis of the State Security Committee. And there are a number of other points that I set out, by the way, in an article for the journal OGONEK which, unfortunately, has not been published, because it was stopped by the KGB leadership.

[Molchanov] You mentioned the service engaged in disinformation—how great are that service's capabilities?

[Kalugin] It has very great capabilities, very great.

[Molchanov] Allow me then, Oleg Danilovch, to ask you a final question. Working in the KGB, you and your colleagues probably frequently forecast situations in which a return to a tough dictatorship might be possible in our country. Do you believe this to be possible, and if so, who?

[Kalugin] I do not believe in a return, because our people are not the same as they were decades ago. When the people were led by the party toward lofty social ideals, they believed in that party. Nowadays, a substantial section of the people do not believe in the party and its leadership, and will therefore not go back along the path of restoring the repressive regime we had in our country for many years. At the same time there may be attempts to return to the past, and incidentally, the KGB has the necessary potential to facilitate this kind of return to the past. Whether it will use this potential is another matter. I think that under certain conditions, if conservative elements became installed in the party leadership, the KGB will be on the side of those who have most strength and power, which means that such attempts cannot be ruled out.

[Molchánov] Yet do you not see as a positive development the fact that over the past few two or three years, as I have observed, people have become far less apprehensive about the KGB?

[Kalugin] Definitely, I think that over the past five years, thanks to glasnost—which, admittedly, is still far from affecting the KGB—nevertheless, with the level of democracy we now have in the country, thanks to television, including programs like yours, people really have come to be less afraid. All the same, however, the power of fear, this psychological fear, hovers over our society like a shadow or specter.

[Molchanov] One final word, but tell us honestly—are you not afraid?

[Kalugin] No, I am worried, but not afraid.

[Molchanov] Then I wish you all the best. Thank you.

[Kalugin] Thank you very much.

Working Group on Control Commissions Meets

PM2106090290 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[A. Petrushov reportage from a session of a preparatory group for the 28th party congress: "We Are in Favor of a Central Control Commission"—date of session not stated]

[Text] History repeats itself. I could not help remembering that expression as I listened to the speeches by members of the group to prepare the draft provision on the CPSU Central Control and Auditing Commission. Those present, among whom were many delegates to the 28th congress and the Russian Party Conference, spoke knowledgeably about the history of party control organs, obviously giving preference to the early twenties, when on V.I. Lenin's initiative control commissions sprang up and were active in the party. "We are for a Central Control Commission"—many speakers summed it up with those words. But other opinions were expressed too. And so, as the saying goes, let us begin at the beginning.

Opening the discussion, **B.K. Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee**, noted that the proposed version of the draft provision takes into account the proposals and comments put forward by communists in the course of discussion of the CPSU Central Committee documents for the 28th congress and received at the Central Committee from local party organs and primary party organizations. The opinions expressed in the PRAVDA "Discussion Sheet" and in other press organs have also been taken into account. The draft reflects letters addressed to the party Control Committee and materials from seminars held by the Social Sciences Academy and from the conference of the chairmen of the control and auditing commissions of kray, oblast, and city party organizations that were set up experimentally. Proposals and comments put forward recently here in this room during the meeting with Moscow party workers and congress delegates not only from the capital have also been used. In short, the draft provision is undergoing a constant process of collective enrichment. And today's session is a continuation of this important work. But questions still remain. What should control commissions do? Where are the central control organ and its chairman to be elected? What are the control organs to be called? To what extent should the provision be reflected in the CPSU Statutes?..

Let me say at once that it is a long time since I came across such a desire to speak out, such heated enthusiasm, at a session like this. Boris Karlovich had barely concluded his introductory remarks when a forest of hands were raised. It seemed to me that he was rather at a loss: To whom should he give the floor, without offending others. But the doubts were resolved by **Anatoliy Vasilyevich Trifonov, lathe operator at the Kokchetav Oxygen and Breathing Apparatus Plant.** Without waiting to be noticed, he declared his presence vigorously, and was already on the platform. Later, Trifonov intervened repeatedly in the discussion from the floor, posing apposite questions and hurling in sharp rejoinders. He was included unanimously on the editorial commission to finalize the proposals and comments put forward at the session. His main point was this:

"There are different opinions in Kazakhstan. Some people think that control commissions are not necessary at all. A good deal of party money is spent on them, to little benefit: They are under the party organs' thumb. Other people say: Leave them as they were. My own opinion? We need party control. And I am unequivocally in favor of the title Central Control Commission. This commission should concern itself with violations specifically by the party's leadership personnel. Only it should not be too extensive. Less, but better—that is the best thing. It should be an independent, autonomous Central Control Commission. As there was under Lenin. It should place reliance in honest, incorruptible communists. The members of the commission and its chairman would not belong to the Central Committee."

Later, leafing through the last two transcripts of party Control Committee sessions on this question, I could not help being surprised at the similarity of the views expressed by the worker **Trifonov** and **Svyatoslav Aleksandrovich Medvedev, first secretary of North Kazakhstan Obkom [oblast party committee].** Judge for yourselves. This is what the first secretary said, before Trifonov:

"The Central Control Commission is a more correct, more accurate title. Control—that means style, methods, and finances. It incorporates everything. The provision on the Central Control Commission should be very thoughtful and intelligent. It should be ratified at the congress. The whole party should know about it. That notorious word 'under' ["pri," meaning under the Central Committee] must be removed. The Central Control Commission should be absolutely independent of the Central Committee and the general secretary, so that it is appropriate to our difficult times. And these times are like the times of the NEP [new economic policy], if not even more dramatic. More than ever before, the party needs a conscience."

Sergey Anatolyevich Nechayev is head of the party organization at the large "Omskagropromstroy" association:

"The Omsk Communists have elected 32 delegates to the congress. And 30 of them think that a Central Control Commission is needed. It should be elected at the congress. Why? So that it is an independent organ within the party and controls not only ordinary communists, but the general secretary himself, who is also bound to fulfill the CPSU Statutes."

Rejoinder:

"Will we not be making a new cult out of the Central Control Commission? Who will control the independent controllers?"

Voice from the auditorium:

"The congress will sort out the details. The congress elects it, and the congress assesses its activity."

S. Kushnin, first secretary of Berezniki party gorkom in Perm Oblast. "I would like to dwell on two aspects. First. In addition to the traditional functions, the Central Control Commission should act as the guarantor of the party masses' power. Power that would prevent the Central Committee from adopting decisions that are unexpected for the communists and therefore are not always supported by them. Let me remind you how shocked we all were by the Central Committee decision on combining posts. Or take the Central Committee open letter. They say one thing and do another. It is the Central Control Commission that should stand guard over intraparty democracy and prevent such things. Second. In my view the Central Control Commission should not be for the entire party, but only for its central organs. You cannot embrace the unembraceable. Furthermore, a Russian Communist Party is apparently going to be set up. So the CPSU Central Committee's powers will change and thus the Central Control Commission will also be different."

A. Yefremov, secretary of the Luganskoye V.I. Lenin Machine Tool Building Plant party committee. "Some 3,500 communists work at our enterprise. There are differing views of party control. Many people are inclined to think that there should be fewer checks of all kinds. We are tired of them, they say. I am one of those who think that control commissions are needed. If only to warn the party committees against mistakes. Remember the saying: Two heads are better than one. Unfortunately the old party control did not achieve its goal. Nor could it, in my view. It was dependent and lacked autonomy, and the communists had little faith in its potential. Furthermore they saw it only as a sword of punishment, generally in relation to ordinary communists. Tell me: Why has no one yet given a principled party assessment of the 'outstanding' political and state figures of the so-called times of stagnation? That question is often raised at the plant. How do you suggest I answer it?"

O. Obichkin, chief of the party building faculty at the Social Sciences Academy. "Let me remind you that control commissions sprang up in the party in the twenties. Why then, specifically? Distressing phenomena were beginning in the party: abuse of official positions, inequality among party members, rampant bureaucracy. The commissions were set up to combat this evil. But is the party healthy today? That is why the question of setting up integrated control organs was raised at the 19th all-Union party conference. The Central Control Commission is a clear and accurate name, a Leninist name. As for its tasks, today as then, one of the main tasks is to preserve the party's unity and prestige and the purity of party ranks and to protect the communist's rights and his honor and dignity against bureaucracy and tyranny. The Central Control Commission must be endowed with substantial rights. To the extent that it could suspend decisions of party executive organs when they go against the Statutes."

Rejoinder:

"But then there will be clashes between the committee and the commission. Who will unravel them?"

O. Ovichkin. "The conciliation commission. There is no need to be afraid of a joint plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission. True, there are misgivings: some bigger than others. But what you could do is this: The question is decided by 'chambers' and by separate voting. On the basis of a two-thirds majority on each side. That must be written into the Statutes. And if a solution is not found even then? Convene an emergency congress, if, of course, the differences are so serious that the party's future is at stake. And another thing. The control commissions should have their own budget."

A. Popelyshko, secretary of the party committee at the Kuybyshev V.I. Lenin Metallurgical Association. "I support the view that the commissions should have their own budget. After all, it is rather paradoxical. Today they criticize you, tomorrow they defer to you. I liked the point in one of the documents that was issued to us where it said that the control commissions could have the right of protection of the minority opinion. That is a very serious point. Only everything must be thoroughly thought out, and this right must become a well regulated mechanism. In this way full-blooded intraparty democracy would be ensured in practice..."

Unfortunately, due to lack of space in the newspaper I cannot even paraphrase all the speeches. And there were many of them. Interesting ideas were also put forward by the following secretaries of party committees: S. **Veniaminov of the "Angarsknefteorgsintez" Association; S. Rafailov of the "Sovetskaya" Mine, Makeyevka, Donetsk Oblast; V. Yegorov of the Moscow "Impuls" Science and Production Association; V. Savchenko of the "Vatutin" Sovkhoz in Vyshgorodskiy Rayon, Kiev Oblast; party raykom [rayon committee] and gorkom first secretaries: A. Ishutin from Sverdlovsk City, V. Zhilkin from Kalinin Oblast, and S. Shtogrin from Khabarovsk Kray; and V. Zorin, second secretary of Karakalpak Uzbek Communist Party Obkom; V. Okhokhonin, chairman of the Kurgan Oblast Party Organization Control and Auditing Commission; and S. Nesterenko, second secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee.**

Despite the differences in approaches, in the main the members of the group believe that in a period of radical changes in the CPSU and in society the party needs an authoritative and effective intraparty control system capable of withstanding both conservative, obsolete traditions and morals and extremist, leftist innovations that undermine the CPSU's unity. At the same time it was stressed that control in the party cnanot be reduced merely to the work of special organs. First and foremost it should be a question of stepping up control by the broad party masses, and the party committees themselves must promote this.

Summing up the results of the discussion, B.K. Pugo noted that all the proposals and observations put forward will be summarized by the editorial commission we have elected and incorporated in a new version of the draft, which we will discuss again at the next session of the group, with the involvement of a wide range of congress delegates.

In conclusion Boris Karlovich spoke of the work of other groups preparing the congress documents and answered questions from those present on the situation in the party and country.

Interethnic Council Chairman Addresses Problems

LD2206024890 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 21 Jun 90

[Interview with Vitaliy Zakharchenko, chairman of the Moscow Interethnic Coordinating Council, by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given; Zakharchenko remarks in Russian fading into English translation—recorded]

[Text] The release of long festering resentment felt by various national and ethnic groups has become a serious problem for this country. The Soviet dis-union, as the Western press calls it, manifests itself in sectarian violence between Armenians and Azerbaijanis, secessionism in the Baltic republics, nationalist demonstrations in Moldavia against what they view as Russification. At the same time, a lot of national societies are being set up across the country. There are more than 20 of them in Moscow alone. Unlike the Union republics, they prefer to act jointly and coordinate their activities and have set up a Moscow Interethnic Coordinating Council. The organization is one year old. We bring you an interview with the Council's chairman, Vitaliy Zakharchenko, who is also a member of the (Slavutich) Ukrainian Cultural Society, and a member of the Moscow chapter of Rukh, a nationalist Ukrainian political movement.

[Begin recording] [Zakharchenko] The (Slavutich) Ukrainian Society has found it extremely difficult to legalize its existence. Official registration was hampered by practically insurmountable obstacles set up by the Moscow City Council in 1988. As we were ploughing through the bureaucratic mess, we maintained close contacts with similar national societies, such as Tartar, Belorussian, and Latvian. Eventually we decided to unite our efforts, for separate organizations can do little. The council was set up in 1989 at the initiative of the (Slavutich) Society and at present more than 20 national societies are full fledged members of the council.

[Correspondent] What's the main goal of your organization?

[Zakharachenko] Our primary goal is to support newly emerging national societies in Moscow, share our experience with them, coordinate our activities. We take part in each other's events, celebrate historical and cultural dates and anniversaries of prominent national personalities. We also exchange information since each national society is closely linked with its republic and has the opportunity to get firsthand information. Take events in Armenia, for one. We get the latest news from our Armenian Society, inform all the members of our council, who then pass the information on to their national societies.

[Correspondent] As far as I know, there exist official missions of our Union republics in Moscow, aren't you doing their job?

[Zakharchenko] Yes we do have such missions in Moscow, but in many cases their work leaves much to be desired. That concerns Belorussian and Ukrainian missions. As a matter of fact, the missions reflect the situation in the republics. Reactionaries who are stil in power in Belorussia and the Ukraine hamper the functioning of national organizations. Of course this isn't true of the Georgian of Estonian missions, they actively participate in the work of local national societies and support them in every possible way, and let me repeat that the situation in each republic determines the work of its mission.

[Correspondent] One year has passed, it was full of work. The council has supported and eased the process of registration to many national societies. All the council's members took an active part in the February and March rallies initiated by Moscow's democratic forces. Unfortunately not all of the council's initiatives were a success.

[Zakharchenko] We also thought it was our main task to be active in developing a workable nationalities policy. Last August the Communist Party's Central Committee published its draft platform on the issue. Council's members carefully studied the draft and thought it was in need of amendments. We worked them out and submitted our considerations to the Central Committee. The draft completely ignored the necessity of concluding a new Union treaty. The absence of such a treaty is the reason for the current embarrassing state of relations between the center and the republics.

[Correspondent] The necessity of such a treaty is reaffirmed now, but at that time the council's idea was neglected.

[Zakharchenko] They should have started with working out a new treaty uniting, attracting Union republics towards each other, taking into account their interests, consolidating the Union. Actually the old treaty was signed by four republics back in 1922, the country has gone through a lot of changes since then. Reminiscences of 68 years ago are no good now. We have 15 Union republics instead of four, to say nothing of the autonomous regions. The Central Committee virtually ignored the amendments stating at the time that it was undesirable to sign another treaty. As a result, national discontent has led to hasty and controversial decisions, at best they are capable of solving the national problems only partially. We had hoped the draft would be submitted to a nationwide discussion, it was not. A month later it was approved and became a legal document of the party. As a matter of fact it turned out to be even weaker than the draft. The document was considered by us as a step back in nationalities policy.

[Correspondent] Actually the Central Committee has ignored your suggestions one year ago. Your experience shows that your actions have rarely been supported by the officials. Is the situation changing now? What can you say about the new Moscow City Council?

[Zakharchenko] We feel that the new City Council takes us seriously and it is really interested in developing mutual contacts. We took part in the work of a City Council Commission on the nationalities issue. All the Council's members have an opportunity to speak about their activities. The Commission came out for this initiative. We decided to maintain close links with each other. We feel they are interested in our activities and we, in turn, are ready to cooperate. [end recording]

Decree on Draft USSR Labor Law Published

904F0192A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[USSR Supreme Soviet Decree "On the Draft Law on Procedures for the Resolution of Individual Labor Disputes and the Expansion of Judicial Protection of the Labor Rights of Citizens and the Law on Amendments and Additions to USSR Legislative Acts on Labor"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet **resolves**:

1. To approve in the first reading the main provisions of the draft Law on Procedures for the Resolution of Individual Labor Disputes of Citizens and the draft Law of Amendments and Additions to USSR Legislative Acts on Labor."

2. To accept the proposal of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation and the Commission of the Soviet of the Union for Issues of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy on the publication in the press of the draft laws prepared by them on the basis of the draft laws submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet by the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] for their discussion in labor collectives.

3. The USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU will summarize proposals and remarks made in the course of discussion of the draft laws in the labor collectives, and will submit materials to the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation and the

Soviet of the Union Commission for Issues of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy before 1 October 1990.

4. Before 1 October 1990, the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU will develop and submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet for consideration the draft Law on the Disciplinary Responsibility of Enterprise, Office, and Organization Managers with a view to ensuring the judicial protection of their labor rights.

5. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation and the Soviet of the Union Commission for Issues of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy will work additionally on the drafts taking into account proposals and remarks voiced by USSR people's deputies and made in the course of discussion in the labor collectives, and submit them for consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov
Moscow, the Kremlin, 8 June 1990

Draft USSR Law on Labor Disputes, Rights

WA2206180590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

["Draft USSR Law on Procedures for the Resolution of Individual Labor Disputes and the Expansion of Judicial Protection of the Labor Rights of Citizens"]

[Text] With a view to expanding the judicial protection of the labor rights of citizens and elimination of the lists of categories of employees whose labor disputes are reviewed along the chain of command, the USSR Supreme Soviet **resolves** :

I. General Provisions

Article 1. The present law regulates procedures for the resolution of individual labor disputes between an employee and the management of an enterprise, office, or organization with regard to the issues of applying norm-setting acts on labor, collective contracts, and other labor agreements.

Individual disputes over setting new conditions of labor for an employee or changing existing conditions are reviewed by the management, the trade union, and the council of the labor collective of an enterprise, office, or organization within the confines of rights given to them.

Article 2. Labor disputes are reviewed:

1) by commissions for labor disputes elected by the labor collectives of enterprises, offices, and organizations;

2) by the trade union committees of enterprises, offices, and organizations (shop trade union committees);

3) rayon (city) people's courts.

The labor disputes of management employees elected, confirmed, or appointed to their positions by the supreme organs of state power and administration of the USSR, Union and autonomous republics over issues of dismissals, changes in the date and wording of the cause of dismissal, transfers to other work, pay for times of forced absence from work or the performance of lower-paid work, and the imposition of administrative penalties are reviewed by superior organs. The employees in question have the right to approach the superior organ with a petition to review a labor dispute within three months of the day when they learn or are supposed to learn about a violation of their rights. Employee petitions are to be considered within one month.

The procedures established by the present law for reviewing labor disputes do not apply to elected employees relieved of their position before the end of term by decisions of the organs which have elected them, as well as to prosecutors, their deputies, assistants, and investigators of the procuracy.

II. Organization and Procedures for the Work of Labor Dispute Commissions

Article 3. Labor dispute commissions are elected by a general meeting (conference) of the labor collective of an enterprise, office, or organization with no fewer than 15 employees.

Candidates who receive a majority of votes and for whom more than one-half of those present at a general meeting (conference) vote are considered elected to the commissions.

The labor dispute commissions elect chairmen, deputy chairmen, and secretaries of the commissions from among their members.

Article 4. By a decision of a general meeting (conference) of the labor collective of an enterprise, office, or organization, labor dispute commissions may be created in shops and other similar subdivisions. These commissions are elected by the collectives of the subdivisions and operate on the same footing as the labor disputes commissions of enterprises, offices, and organizations.

Only labor disputes within the confines of rights given to these subdivisions may be reviewed by the labor dispute commissions of subdivisions.

Article 5. The labor dispute commission is a mandatory primary organ for reviewing labor disputes which arise at an enterprise, office, or organization, except for disputes over issues for which a different review procedure is envisaged by the present law or other legislative acts.

Article 6. Employees may approach a commission on labor disputes within three months of the day when they learn or are supposed to learn about a violation of their rights.

If the deadline set is not met for a valid reason, a labor dispute commission may redesignate it.

Article 7. An employee petition which is filed with a commission is subject to compulsory registration.

Organizational and technical support for the labor dispute commissions is provided by the management of enterprises, offices, and organizations.

Article 8. A labor dispute commission must review a labor dispute within 10 days of the day the petition is filed. All disputes should be reviewed in the presence of the employee filing a petition and representatives of the management and the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization. In absentia review of disputes is only permissible on the basis of a written petition by the employee.

If the employee fails to appear at a meeting of the commission, the consideration of his petition is postponed until the next meeting. If the employee fails to appear for a second time for no valid reason the commission may resolve to remove this petition from the agenda, which does not deprive the employee of the right to refile his petition.

Article 9. A labor dispute commission has the right to call witnesses and invite specialists to its meetings. The management of an enterprise, office, or organization must submit the calculations and documents needed at the request of the commission.

Article 10. The meeting of a commission has a quorum if more than one-half of the members elected to the commission are present at it.

The employee concerned and the management have the right to request a substantiated elimination of any member of the commission. The issue of elimination is resolved by a majority vote of commission members in attendance at the meeting.

Article 11. A labor dispute commission adopts resolutions by a majority of votes of those present at its meeting.

Minutes are kept at commission meetings, which are signed by the chairman and the secretary.

Copies of the minutes of a commission meeting are furnished within three days to the trade union committee and the management of the enterprise, and an extract from the minutes is furnished to the employee within the same period of time. A resolution of the commission based on the minutes is drawn up which indicates the full name of the enterprise, office, or organization, the last and first names and the patronymic of the employee who has approached the commission, the date of application to the commission, the date the dispute was reviewed, the essence of the dispute, the names of the commission members, representatives of the management and the trade union committee (shop trade union committee) who were present at the meeting, the results of the voting, and a substantiated resolution of the commission.

Article 12. The resolution of a labor dispute commission may be appealed by the employee concerned or the management at the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) or, at their option, at a people's court within 10 days of the day they are handed an extract from the minutes of a commission meeting or a copy of the minutes. If the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) or the people's court recognize the reasons for missing the deadline in question to be valid, they may redesignate the deadline and consider the essence of the dispute.

III. Review of Labor Disputes by the Trade Union Committees of Enterprises, Offices, and Organizations

Article 13. The trade union committees of enterprises, offices, and organizations (shop trade union committees) review labor disputes on the basis of a petition by an employee or the management who disagree with the decision of a labor dispute commission.

Article 14. At an enterprise, office, or organization at which the trade union committee has been given the rights of a rayon trade union committee, labor disputes reviewed by the commission of the enterprise, office, or organization are resolved by the presidium of the trade union committee of the enterprise, office, or organization.

Article 15. When a petition by an employee or the management of an enterprise, office, or organization who disagree with a resolution of the labor dispute commission is considered, the trade union committee of the enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) adopts a resolution on the essence of the dispute.

On its own initiative or in response to a protest by the procurator, the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) may accept a labor dispute for consideration if the labor dispute commission adopts a resolution contravening legislation.

Article 16. The trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) must consider a petition (protest) on a labor dispute within 10 days of the date it is filed.

The petition (protest) on a labor dispute is reviewed by the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) in keeping with the procedures envisaged by Articles 8, 9, and 10 of the present law. The resolution of the trade union committee (shop trade union committee) should meet the requirements in effect for the decisions of labor dispute commissions (Article 11 of the present law).

The resolution is handed within three days to the management of an enterprise, office, or organization (subdivision) and the employee concerned.

IV. Procedures for the Execution of Decisions of Labor Dispute Commissions and Resolutions of Trade Union Committees of Enterprises, Offices, and Organizations

Article 17. The decisions of the labor dispute commissions and the resolutions of the trade union committees of enterprises, offices, and organizations (shop trade union committees) with regard to labor disputes are to be executed by the management of the enterprises, offices, and organizations within 10 days of the adoption of the decision or resolution, unless a different deadline is indicated in the decision or resolution.

Article 18. In the event the management of an enterprise, office, or organization fails to execute the decision of the labor dispute commission before the deadline set, the trade union committee of the enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) issues a certificate to the employee which is equivalent to a court order.

A certificate is also issued to the employee if the management of the enterprise, office, or organization fails before the set deadline to execute a resolution on a labor dispute adopted by the trade union committee of the enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union organization).

The certificate indicates the name of the organ which has adopted the decision or resolution on a labor dispute, the date of its adoption and the issuance of the certificate, the last name, first name, and patronymic of the employee, and a decision on the essence of the dispute. The certificate is given under the signature of the chairman of the trade union committee of the enterprise, office, or organization and the seal of the trade union committee (when appropriate, the seal of a superior trade union organ).

The certificate is not issued if the employee or the management of the enterprise, office, or organization file a petition for the resolution of a labor dispute with the trade union committee or a rayon (city) people's court.

Article 19. Proceeding from a certificate issued by the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization and produced to the rayon (city) people's court no later than within three months, an officer of the court enforces the decision of a labor dispute commission or the resolution of a trade union committee on a compulsory basis.

If the employee misses the three-month deadline set for a valid reason, the trade union committee of the enterprise, office, or organization which has issued the certificate may resolve to have the deadline redesignated.

V. Consideration of Labor Disputes in Rayon (City) People's Courts

Article 20. Labor disputes are considered by rayon (city) people's courts by virtue of petitions from:

a) employees or the management when they disagree with a decision of the labor dispute commission or a resolution of the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee);

b) on the basis of a protest by a procurator if a decision of the labor dispute commission or a resolution of the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) contravenes legislation.

Article 21. Labor disputes involving the following petitions are reviewed directly by the rayon (city) people's courts:

a) by the employees of enterprises, offices, and organizations in which labor dispute commissions are not elected;

b) by employees on reinstatement in their positions, regardless of the grounds for the discontinuation of the labor contract, on changing the date and the wording of the cause of dismissal, with the exception of disputes involving the employees referred to in Parts 2 and 3 of Article 2 of the present law, as well as on pay for periods of forced absence from work or performing lower-paid work;

c) by the management on compensation for damages caused to an enterprise, office, or organization;

d) by employees regarding the issues of application of labor law which were previously resolved by the management, in keeping with the legislation in effect, in coordination or jointly with the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) within the confines of rights given to them.

Disputes are also considered directly by the rayon (city) people's courts which involve refusals to hire:

a) employees invited to work through the procedure of transferring from another enterprise, office, or organization;

b) young specialists who have graduated from a higher or special secondary educational establishment, as well as individuals who have graduated from a vocational-technical school and have been referred for work to a given enterprise, office, or organization through established procedures;

c) other people with whom the management of an enterprise, office, or organization is obligated to sign labor contracts under the law.

Article 22. A petition for resolving a labor dispute is filed directly with a rayon (city) people's court within three months of the day when an employee learns or is supposed to learn about a violation of his rights, and in cases of dismissal—within one month of the date of being handed the dismissal order.

The deadline of one year from the day a loss inflicted by an employee is discovered is set for the management to approach the court on the issue of collecting from the employee the financial loss inflicted on the enterprise, office, or organization.

Article 23. Employees approaching the rayon (city) people's court with demands ensuing from legal labor relations are exempt from paying court costs to the state budget.

VI. Making and Executing Decisions on Disputes Involving Dismissals and Transfers to Other Work

Article 24. In the event of a dismissal without legitimate grounds or an unlawful transfer to other work, an employee should be reinstated in his previous job by the organ reviewing the labor dispute.

While making a decision on reinstatement in a job, the organ reviewing the dispute at the same time makes a decision on paying the employee his average pay for the period of forced absence from work or the difference in pay for the period of performing lower-paid work, but not for more than three months.

In the event the wording of the cause of dismissal is found to be incorrect or not in compliance with the legislation in effect, the organ reviewing a labor dispute must change it and indicate in its decision the cause of dismissal in strict compliance with the wording in the legislation in effect and with a reference to the proper article (point) of the law. If the incorrect wording of the cause of dismissal in the labor record booklet interfered with the hiring of the employee for another job, the organ reviewing a labor dispute makes a simultaneous decision on the payment of his average wages to the employee for the duration of his forced absence from work but for no more than three months.

Article 25. A decision made by an organ reviewing labor disputes on reinstating in his job an employee who has been illegally dismissed or transferred to another job is to be executed immediately.

If the management of an enterprise, office, or organization delays the execution of a court ruling on reinstating in his job a worker who has been dismissed or transferred to other work illegally, the court which has resolved to reinstate the employee in his job rules that he be paid the average pay or the difference in pay for the time of delay.

If the execution of the pertinent decision of a superior organ is delayed, this organ makes a decision on the payment of the average pay or the difference in pay for the time of delay.

Article 26. An organ reviewing the dispute has a right to make a decision on the payment of funds the employee is due for not more than three years in the course of reviewing labor disputes over issues involving financial claims, with the exception of demands to pay the employee his average pay for the period of forced absence from work or the difference in pay for the period of performing lower-paid work (Article 24 of the present law).

Draft Law on Amendments to Labor Law

WA2206181190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

["Draft USSR Law on Amendments and Additions to USSR Legislative Acts on Labor"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet **resolves** :

To make the following amendments and additions to the USSR legislative acts on labor:

1) In the Fundamentals of the Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics on Labor adopted by the USSR Law dated 15 July 1970 (VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1970, No. 29, page 265; 1982, No. 19, page 318; 1983, No. 5, page 74, No. 33, page 507; 1988, No. 6, page 95):

a) Article 18 will be worded as follows:

"Article 18. Prohibition of the cancellation of labor contracts on the initiative of the management without the consent of the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization

The cancellation of a labor contract on the initiative of the management of an enterprise, office, or organization is not allowed without the consent of the trade union committee of the enterprise, office, or organization, except in the case of:

the liquidation of an enterprise, office, or organization;

unsatisfactory results of the probation period set at the time of hiring;

dismissal from a second job in conjunction with the hiring of another employee who is not a part-time job holder, or in conjunction with the introduction of restrictions on holding second jobs."

The discharge of the manager of an enterprise, office, or organization, as well as management employees elected, confirmed, or appointed to their positions by the supreme organs of state power and management of the USSR, Union and autonomous republics, is performed without the consent of the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization;

2) in Article 86:

in Point 1 of the first part the words "organized at enterprises, offices, and organizations, with an equal number of the representatives of trade union committees and representatives of the management" will be replaced with the words "elected by the labor collectives of enterprises, offices, and organizations";

the second part will be worded as follows:

"Labor disputes involving management employees elected, confirmed, or appointed to their positions by the supreme organs of state power and administration of the USSR, Union and autonomous republics, over issues of discharge, changing the date and wording of the cause of discharge, transfers to other work, payment for the period of forced absence from work or performing lower-paid work, and the imposition of disciplinary penalties, are reviewed by superior organs. General procedures for the review of labor disputes do not apply to elected employees who are relieved of their position before the end of term by a decision of the organs which elected them, as well as procurators, their deputies, assistants, and investigators of the procuracy";

3) the second part of Article 87 will be deleted;

4) the first part of Article 88 will be worded as follows:

"The trade union committees of enterprises, offices, and organizations review labor disputes involving petitions by workers and clerical employees when they disagree with the decision of a labor dispute commission, and adopt a resolution on the essence of the dispute";

5) Article 89 will be worded as follows:

"Article 89. Consideration of labor disputes by rayon (city) people's courts

Labor disputes are considered by rayon (city) people's courts by virtue of petitions:

a) by workers, clerical employees, and the management when they disagree with the decision of the labor dispute commission or the resolution of the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee);

b) on the basis of a protest by a procurator if the decision of a labor dispute commission or the resolution of a trade union committee (shop trade union committee) contravene legislation.

Labor disputes involving the following petitions are reviewed directly by the rayon (city) people's courts:

a) by employees of enterprises, offices, and organizations in which labor dispute commissions are not elected;

b) by workers and clerical employees on reinstatement in their positions, regardless of the grounds for the discontinuation of the labor contract, on changing the date and the wording of the cause of dismissal, with the exception of disputes involving employees for whom different procedures of considering disputes are envisaged, as well as on pay for the period of forced absence from work or performing lower-paid work;

c) by the management on compensation for losses caused to an enterprise, office, or organization by workers and clerical employees;

d) by employees regarding issues of the application of labor law which were previously resolved by the management, in keeping with the legislation in effect, in coordination or jointly with the trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization (shop trade union committee) within the confines of rights given to them.

Disputes are also considered directly by the rayon (city) people's courts involving refusals to hire:

a) employees invited to work through the procedure of transferring from another enterprise, office, or organization;

b) young specialists who have graduated from a higher or special secondary educational establishment, as well as individuals who have graduated from a vocational-technical school and have been referred for work to a given enterprise, office, or organization through the established procedures;

c) other persons with whom the management of an enterprise, office, or organization is obligated to sign a labor contract pursuant to legislation";

6) in part four of Article 90, the words "along the chain of command" will be deleted;

7) in Article 94:

the first part will be worded as follows:

"Labor disputes involving management employees elected, confirmed, or appointed to their positions by the supreme organs of state power and administration of the USSR, Union and autonomous republics, over issues of discharge, changing the date and wording of the cause of discharge, transfers to other work, payment for the period of forced absence from work or performing lower-paid work, and the imposition of disciplinary penalties, are reviewed by superior organs. General procedures for the review of labor disputes do not apply to elected employees who are relieved of their position before the end of term by a decision of the organs that elected them, as well as procurators, their deputies, assistants, and investigators of the procuracy";

In the second part, the words "along the chain of command" will be deleted;

8) in Article 99-1 the words "complaints by managers and foremen about discharges from work, and those of brigade leaders about their removal from brigade management, are reviewed jointly by the superior economic and trade union organs" will be deleted;

9) in Article 106 Point 4 the words "a one-time grave violation of his labor duties by an employee subject to disciplinary responsibility along the chain of command" will be deleted;

10) in the first part of Article 107 the words "categories of employees whose labor disputes are reviewed along

the chain of command (the first part of Article 94)" will be replaced with the words: "categories of employees whose labor disputes are reviewed by the superior organs (the first part of Article 94)."

2. The first part of Article 19 of the Regulations on the Rights of Trade Union Committees of Enterprises, Offices, and Organizations confirmed by an ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium dated 27 September 1971 (VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNGO SOVETA SSSR, 1971, No. 39, page 382; 1982, No. 19, page 318) will be worded as follows:

"19. The trade union committee of an enterprise, office, or organization reviews labor disputes on the basis of petitions by workers and clerical employees or the management when they disagree with the decision of a labor dispute commission, and adopts a resolution on the essence of the dispute."

3. The following are invalidated:

1) decree of the USSR TsIK [Central Executive Committee] and the SNK [Council of People's Commissars] dated 13 October 1929 "On the Fundamentals of Disciplinary Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics" (SVOD ZAKONOV SSSR, 1929, No. 71, page 670);

2) decree of the USSR TsIK and the SNK dated 7 July 1932 No. 42/904 "On the Responsibility of the Employees of Offices and the Management Apparatus of Economic Organs for Violating the Rules of General and Fire Protection of Official Buildings and Premises and the Rules for Storage of Official Documents" (SVOD ZAKONOV SSSR, No. 53, page 319; VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1956, No. 18, page 391);

3) Article 2 of the Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium dated 12 January 1961 "On Amending and Invalidating Legislative Acts in Conjunction with the USSR Law Dated 11 February 1957 'On Transferring to the Jurisdiction of Union Republics Legislation on the Structure of the Courts of the Union Republics and the Adoption of Civil, Criminal, and Procedural Codes,' the USSR Laws Dated 25 December 1958 on Confirming the Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation, the Fundamentals of Legislation on the Structure of the Courts, the Fundamentals of Criminal Court Procedures, the Regulations on the Court Martial and the USSR Laws Dated 25 December 1958 on Criminal Penalties for State and Military Crimes" (VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1961, No. 4, page 35);

4) Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium dated 30 September 1965 "On Procedures for Applying Article 10 of the Regulations on the Rights of Factory, Plant, and Local Committees of Trade Unions" (VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1965, No. 40, page 587);

5) Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium dated 7 May 1974 "On Procedures for Reviewing Labor Disputes Involving Issues of Discharges or Changing the Wording of the Cause of Dismissal of General School Teachers Found to Be Unqualified for the Positions Held in the Course of Certification" (VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1974, No. 20, page 307);

6) Regulations on Procedures for Reviewing Labor Disputes adopted by the Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium dated 20 May 1974 (VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSR, 1974, No. 22, page 325; 1983, No. 5, page 74; No. 33, page 507).

Alternative Draft Law on Public Groups Presented

PM2706082590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 90 p 1

[L. Nikitinskiy report: "'Left-Wing' Draft"]

[Text] The official presentation of an alternative draft Law on Citizens' Public Associations (on the freedom of unions) in the USSR, took place 20 June in the building of the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. The draft was presented by its authors: USSR People's Deputy S. Stankevich and Doctor of Juridical Sciences M. Fedotov.

The official draft USSR Law on Public Associations was already approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet at first reading and was published in the newspapers at the beginning of June. Are the authors of the initiative draft not too late with their initiative? Addressing the deputies, journalists, scientists, and representatives of informal organizations present, Sergey Stankevich noted that the official draft law already incorporates a large number of the progressive provisions in the initiative draft law. At the same time, their group will insist on the advantages of their version during the voting at the second reading at the next session.

For example, the Stankevich-Fedotov-Soldatov draft more consistently expresses the idea of the depoliticization of public associations. It is being proposed that the creation and activity of political parties and public associations connected with them be prohibited in the USSR Armed Forces, the KGB organs, the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the USSR Foreign Ministry, the prosecutor's office, the courts, and the court of arbitration.

The alternative draft is to be discussed in parallel with the official one and on equal terms, S. Stankevich stressed. It is only competition in legislative work, like in any other sphere of activity for that matter, that can ensure the high quality of "manufactured products."

Corrections to Press Law, Resolution Issued

PM2206150790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Correction"]

[Text] After the publication in IZVESTIYA of the Law "On the Press and Other Mass Information Media," TASS has issued two corrections to the text:

Beginning of Article 29. **Journalist** "In the present Law the term journalist is taken to mean [ponimayetsya] a person..."—is rendered in the new version as: "In accordance with the present law a journalist is [yavlyayetsya] a person..."

Paragraph four of the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the Enactment of the USSR Law 'On the Press and Other Mass Information Media'" incorrectly omitted the word "Culture" from the title of the Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing.

Constitutional Compliance Committee Meets

Cites Labor Dispute Law

LD2206010990 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 21 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—The USSR Constitutional Compliance Committee today cited legal acts as inconsistent with the Constitution. These acts deprive some categories of citizens of the right to defend their rights in labour disputes in court. The number of people who, for example, can appeal only to higher authorities and not to the court over their dismissal now exceeds 20 million.

Initially, court protection was denied to the employees of bodies of state power, but gradually the prohibition lists have been extended to include even such groups of office workers as doctors and teachers.

The extension accelerated during the 1970s. Complaints from the "victims" of labour disputes, resolved at work places and most often in the biased way, make up the lion's share of all appeals to the state bodies.

In today's decision the committee stressed the need to allow those categories that did not have the right to appeal to court before to do so within three months. A relevant legal act has already been passed in the first reading at the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The committee has yet to decide if complaints over labour disputes in previous years can be taken to court. The problem is compounded by the fact that courts are poorly prepared for a sharp increase in the number of such cases.

The Constitutional Compliance Committee also raised the issue of whether or not the Presidential Decree complied with union legislation. It was decided to consider the question at the next session and preliminary to send the draft decision to interested bodies and individuals within a period established by law (not later than 15 days before its consideration).

Civil Rights Viewed

LD2206211690 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 22 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 22 TASS - The main task of the Constitutional Compliance Committee is to assert human rights in the USSR as a daily juridical reality and the basis for all state decisions, its Chairman Sergey Alekseyev told a news conference today. The committee's yesterday ruling on the unconstitutionality of all restrictions on the protection of civil rights in court marked an important step in that direction.

The decision put an end to discrimination against the 23 million Soviet citizens who were banned by government decision from defending their labour rights in court. For example, they could only appeal to higher authorities over their dismissals. Initially, court protection was denied mainly to workers of bodies of state power and management and managers of enterprises, but gradually the prohibition lists were extended to include even such groups of office workers as doctors and teachers.

The Constitutional Compliance Committee gave three months in which to set down a procedure for these categories of employees to appeal to court. The ball is now in the Supreme Soviet's court. It has already approved the first reading of the relevant legal act at its third session.

The Constitutional Compliance Committee faces a number of difficult problems. This autumn it plans to decide whether or not the existing system of residence permits is constitutional. As deputy chairman of the committee Boris Nikolskiy stressed, curbs on freedom of movement and choice of profession stemming from residence permits run counter to human rights and must be abolished. Residence permits can perform only registration functions.

However the abolition of residence permits will be inevitably followed by the introduction of a free market of housing and prompt the state to stop its free distribution. However a great number of people have to wait for years to receive accommodation in state-owned flats. Therefore the existing system cannot be abolished overnight. While recognising the incompatability of residence permits with the constitution, a certain period should be allowed in order to settle related problems, Alekseyev said.

'Separation of Powers' Urged

LD2306075890 Moscow TASS in English 0729 GMT 23 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov:]

[Text] Moscow June 23 TASS— The key to the settlement of disputes arising between federal and republican legislation is in the clear cut separation of powers between the Union and the republics, says Soviet lawyer Sergey Alexeyev who heads the USSR Constitution complicance committee. The issue has acquired special prominence after the recent promulgation by Georgia, Russia and Uzbekistan of decrees on supremacy of republican laws over the federal ones.

In a conversation with journalists, Alexeyev stressed that he was speaking not on behalf of the committee but in his capacity of a private individual and specialist in the legal field. The fact is that in keeping with the decision of the Second Congress of People's Deputies, the constitution compliance committee does not deal with matters relating to republican legislation and its correlation with the USSR constitution and federal laws.

Union and autonomus republics and other national-state formations must become sovereign states, Alexeyev stressed. But their statehood should be sealed in strict accordance of legal culture. All kinds of sudden unilateral actions, introducing destructive elements into the obtaining realities, are impermissible.

Alexeyev said that the generally accepted thesis concerning Union law supremeacy over republican laws needs correcting.

"Both Union and republican laws must be equally significant and important from the legal point of view," Alexeyev said. Republican legislation must occupy a substantial place in the entire legal infrastructure of the Soviet state."

At the same time the adoption without any restrictions of the decision to proclaim the suppremacy of republican laws over Union laws, he said, does not hold water. In this case, Union legislation becomes senseless as it turns into a set of recommendations and all legal connections between republics are lost. They become completely isolated, which is not consistent with modern understanding not only of what a federation is but also what a confederation is. Even in international relations international laws are granted priority over national legislation.

The contradiction between the Union and republican laws could be eliminated on the basis of the principle in accordance with which republican laws are announced as having priority and supremeacy on all matters not vested in the competence of the Union, Alexeyev said.

The principle of republican law supremacy is applicable within the confines of a republic exercising its invincible state sovereignty. This makes expedient the conclusion of a Union treaty, which will seal specific competencies of the Union and the republics, as well as areas of their joint authority.

Yakovlev Book on Socialism Reviewed

PM2106154090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 24, 12-18 Jun 90 pp 34-35

[Tatyana Kuzmina review of "Realism: The Land of Perestroyka" by CPSU Central Committee Secretary Aleksandr Yakovlev: "Farewell to Socialism for Dependants"]

[Text] Who wants to read about socialism now? Several nations have bundled it off hurriedly and without delay. We ourselves have lived hard under it. One can easily understand the man who says: "Stop talking about your socialism. Don't fool us."

Nevertheless, a book about socialism was sold out quickly recently. It was not placed on the selves usually allotted in our bookshops to political literature. It is known that such shelves are numerous and people rarely buy from them. The book concerned was put on a separate table, where books just off the press are displayed. No sooner than another batch is brought out, it is immediately sold out.

Perhaps it is not a political book? No, it is political. Moreover, it is not only about perestroika. It is also about socialism. The book was written by Aleksandr Yakovlev, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, and is put out by the Political Literature Publishing House in Moscow.

Feudalism is power of the land, capitalism is power of capital, and socialism is power of society or the people. This formula, perhaps too simple, is the most understandable to me. It was not socialism which whole nations and countries dismissed, and the society under which we lived hard was not socialist.

Though this idea sounds non-topical and will not arouse sympathy, I shall nevertheless express it, because we now have a pluralism of views and everyone has the right to make his ideas known to others. The idea is that those who have given up "socialism" will inevitably strive for it, though they might refer to it by a different name. Unaware of this fact, the highly industrialized nations are slowly and gradually advancing towards socialism, though perhaps quicker than our country, which is now marking time.

We shall also move in this same direction if we manage to abandon the obsolete dogmas of Stalinsim. True, I am not sure that we will be able to jettison these docmas soon. We shall move towards the power of society, towards practical humanism, a society in which the free development of one person is a condition for the free development of all, towards freedom, equality and fraternity.

I have not met any honest people who would speak out against such a way, such development, and such a social goal. This idea is close to honest men and women of any political affiliation. Only clever people understand that this is precisely an ideal, and a very remote one. Mankind will achieve it some time in the future, perhaps by joint efforts or, more precisely, by the joint progress of all nations. However, it is noble to see this ideal, strive for it, make efforts to achieve it, and this loftiness of thoughts is a sign of human probity.

All these thoughts came to my mind upon reading Aleksandr Yakovlev's book. In these dramatic days when the government reports about "the first moves towards the market" and it turns out that the very first move is an increase in bread prices, when our future is being decided in the hard struggle at the Congress of Deputies of Russia, when the shelves of our shops have been swept of food products, when serious developments are taking place in the Baltic republics, Moldavia, Azerbaijan, Armenia and the Ukraine, in these days one has no desire to read any book, any prose or poems. "I ask myself what forces and factors stubbornly hinder social renovation, perestroika, and discredit the reforms initiated in our country," writes Aleksandr Yakovlev, whose book is entitled "Realism: the Land of Perestroika." This question is persistently asked by many people. The author answers that these forces and factors are "mismanagement, cadging practices, bureaucratism, conservatism and nationalism." At first, the answer seems to be simple and unsatisfactory. But when you think it over, you see that the first impression was wrong. The answer seems to be simple and unsatisfactory. But when you think it over, you see that .he first impression was wrong. The answer is simple and comprehensive. Any additions to the list of the "enemies" of perestroika are covered by it.

In the book you come across the term "socialism for dependants," which has not been used before in journalism. It is a very accurate term. "There is no doubt," Aleksandr Yakovlev writes in his book, "that progress is impeded by those who have gotten used to the old, quiet and, more exactly, stagnant way of life, and look upon the state as a rich philanthropist who gives out blessings almost automatically, regardless of man's labour contribution.

Indeed, the social system under which we grew up and lived can be called "socialism for dependants." It means the power of dependants, the bureaucratic administrative system, the party apparatus, full-time trade union functionaries, and the majority of people who have been depraved by hack work, incompetence, hard drinking and have forgotten how to work diligently.

"When for the first time in many years and in some cases perhaps for the first time in their lives, these people were required to bear the responsibility for their official and public actions, they felt feverish in such a hot time. The elementary demand seemed almost insulting to them. The negative reaction comes not only from officials of various ranks, but also from that part of ordinary workers who have gotten used to living thanks to wage levelling and to working carelessly," Aleksandr Yakovlev writes in his book. "There are still plenty of idlers, bad workmen, and those who violate labour and production discipline in our country."

Their numbers are legion. "Socialism for dependants" has bred almost whole generations of such people. Today, when they are rallying under the slogan, "Let's not lose the gains of socialism," they have in mind precisely this main, and only, gain of their "socialism for dependants," namely, to work in such a way that one could not make out whether it is work or a strike. "For what have we fought?" these people ask, and the implied answer is: "We have fought in order to be able to work negligently and to live as other people do."

"Perestroika leads to social inequality," these people shout, understanding that in a normal society to be built by reform the lazy, worthless and negligent worker is not and cannot be equal to an industrious, talented and diligent worker.

The former "masters of their lives," dependants of all kinds, have adopted old slogans and symbols. I would like to believe very much, and I hope other people share this view, that socialism has nothing to do with these slogans and symbols. "Socialism for dependants" is not real socialism. The main segment of the populace is not made up of dependants. "Historical experience clearly shows that social progress proved successful only when a prime concern was shown for man, not for some or other, even though important, but separate symbols of his being," Aleksandr Yakovlev writes. These words are naturally unpalatable to those who are irritated by his articles, statements and activities and are unable to bear him personally.

A number of dull and unpopular periodicals have malevolently attacked Yakovlev's book as a live and dangerous enemy. The book is indeed the living truth. The author passionately expresses his thoughts and tries to prove those truths dear to him, citing dozens of arguments in their favour. He refutes ideas alien to him, what he regards as stupidity and incompetence, and he does this in a convincing, sharp and precise manner.

The main thing is, however, that Yakovlev knows well the nature, history, features and destiny of home-bred and world conservatism. His clear perception of conservatism is naturally unbearable to its representatives. Quoting the great Italian Benedetto Croce, Yakovlev exclaims: "Freedom is the creator of history!" In his opinion, these words sound more convincing today than ever before.

The sweet word "freedom" has always acted on part of the population like a red flag on a bull. Aleksandr Yakovlev is a staunch champion of freedom, and his book is a textbook not for abstract freedom-lovers, but for those who are fighting for freedom under today's concrete circumstances. No wonder that the author and his book are not agreeable to many people.

One should think but not wonder. All who are honestly living through these dramatic days should think together how to protect and preserve perestroika because it is our chance to join the family of nations, build a humane society, and protect our children from a humiliating, poor and disgraceful life. For our children, perestroika is the last possibility and for us it is the last chance. We should ponder over it, and this book will help us in this respect.

Supreme Soviet Ratifies UN Convention

90US1065A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed article: "Today, Right Now, This Minute"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet has ratified the Convention on Children's Rights adopted last fall at the 44th session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Following this momentous event writer Albert Likhanov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, board chairman of the Soviet Children's Foundation imeni V.I. Lenin, and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Subcommittee on Children's Issues, stated:

"The convention first of all defines the normal state of normal children. But at the same time it addresses the rights of a special group of children—mentally retarded, sick, refugee children, children in regions of armed conflict, and children who have committed crimes.

"The Convention on Children's Rights asserts the right of survival and development, the right of mental and physical rehabilitation and social reintegration, the right of adoption of children in other lands. It is the observance of all obligations adults have to children, their protection from abuse from those entrusted with their care, including their parents and guardians, members of their families. The convention affords children the legal right to parents' care and nonseparation from parents, the right to be reunited with their family and maintain contacts with both parents, and the rights—as yet so unfamiliar in our reality but absolutely legitimate—of children to express their opinions independently, freedom of thought, freedom of conscience and religion, freedom to live their own personal lives and participate in associations...

"We must adopt as swiftly as possible the USSR Law on Children's Rights, for which the UN Convention is the prototype. Literally everything today demands immediate resolution. Debates are underway in the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies, in the Supreme Soviets of the Union republics, and in the autonomous okrugs and oblasts. Whatever problems you have there, even the most complex issues can wait a little bit longer—but the child cannot wait! We must not continue telling him (as has long been the case): 'Tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, in a week,' for his name is 'Today, right now, this minute.'

"Recognizing the child's right to be small, we recognize his right to be tall—not in size, but in spirit. We thus acknowledge his right to become great and magnanimous, a strong member of our society enjoying full rights.

Committee for Maritime Security Established

LD2206031390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 21 Jun 90

[Summary] Moscow, 21 Jun (TASS)—A new nongovernmental organization—the Soviet Committee for Peace, Disarmament, and Ecological Safety on the Seas and Oceans—was set up today at an inaugural conference in Moscow. Major-General of Justice (Rtd) Petr Barabolya heads the new organization. The committee, which was set up by activists of the Soviet anti-war movement, intends to take an active part in preparations for the world conference on naval disarmament, which is scheduled for 1992.

Economic

Abalkin Interviewed on Market Economy Transition

LD2706104190 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] [Announcer] The Supreme Soviet has rejected this month the Government's program of transition to market economy, the shape it was presented in, and sent it back for overhauling. Radio Moscow has interviewed the author of the program, Deputy Premier Dr. Leonid Abalkin:

Dr. Leonid Abalkin, what is happening to the program now?

[Abalkin in Russian with superimposed English translation] We are working how to amend it. The Supreme Soviet has given the green light for practical actions and by September we're to present a final version specifying the main direction and the dates. Besides, we've been authorized to issue temporary decrees under the new laws on property, on land, on leasing, and others. Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov signed the other day a ruling on setting up joint stock companies and business partnerships and on the issue of securities and shares.

[Announcer] Will prices rise on food and other consumer essentials? Dr. Leonid Abalkin:

[Abalkin] Prices are sure to rise, that can't be avoided. This is the logic of markets. A deep disbalance of supply and demand has to lead to rising prices. This may take different forms—black market prices, for instance—and that's the experience of the world economy last century and this century, and there is the same next century too.

[Announcer] How are you planning to go about price rises?

[Abalkin] Our program is, in my view, a carefully balanced plan providing for a change of prices beginning with next year. We also mean to introduce a new taxation system on the same date.

[Announcer] Would you say if you're standing as an economist has risen or fallen of late in this country and abroad?

[Abalkin] It has certainly fallen at home, and the standing of the Soviet leadership abroad is much higher than here, let me tell you! I'm sure of that, but then I knew what I was tackling.

[Announcer] Do you mean you've thrown yourself in the gaping hole?

[Abalkin] That's not the point. I mean I knew this job would not make me popular. I have to choose between my popularity, stay apart from the Government and criticize from the sidelines, or take on responsibility [sentence as heard]. The responsibility that falls on any statesman in this situation is tremendous. For the sake of success, for shaping the country's destiny, for the nation's peace, if you please, one should sacrifice popularity.

[Announcer] You mentioned the country's destiny. What do you think it will be? Also your own future, if your program fails?

[Abalkin] I have no personal problems. I'd go back to research which I'm fond of. I'm convinced that we've chosen one of the best varients of passing on to market economy as smoothly as possible, without too great losses. I think that another version will entail more jolts and sacrifices and cuts.

[Announcer] Do you have President Gorbachev's support?

[Abalkin] I can't answer that with a simple yes or no. I can tell you that the Government's program had been twice discussed at the Presidential Council and approved by it in its final shape. This was a positive evaluation of the program, but my relations with Gorbachev are complicated enough. We have inevitable differences in tactics and the sequence of certain measures and insistence in carrying them out. But you can't expect us to see all things eye to eye. On the whole we have a common strategy of transition to market economy under the general trend of restructuring.

[Announcer] And do you in turn support President Gorbachev?

[Abalkin] I can answer the same—yes—in the strategic approach in principle. But I think he's inconsistent and irresolute in many ways. I'd like to see him as the integrating force working for the country's consolidation. Without such consolidation or national accord our reforms will be doomed to failure.

Agricultural

Weather, Crop Conditions Reported

904B0246A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 26 Jun 90 p 1

[Report by N. Korenkova, agricultural meteorologist: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Cool weather is being noted over a large part of the USSR's European territory with rainy weather in a number of places. The average air temperature in the majority of regions was one to three degrees lower than the average annual temperature.

In the southern Ukraine, Moldavia, Krasnodar Kray, southern Rostov Oblast, eastern Stavropol Kray, Astrakhan Oblast, and the Kalmyk ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] the winter wheat had reached gold ripeness and the winter barley had reached complete ripeness. Over the rest of the territory of the Ukraine, southwestern Belorussia, southeastern central Chernozem region, and the Volga region (south of Saratov) the wheat and rye were showing milky ripeness. They were blooming over a large part of Belorussia and the Northwestern, Central, centrai Chernozem, Volga, and Ural regions. The rye finished forming ears in the Northern and Volga-Vyatka regions and in the northern Ural region. Because of a prolonged absence of heat, the pace of development of the winter crops has slowed: The amount by which they were ahead in comparison to the annual average has decreased significantly and is now five to 10 days.

The cool, rainy weather created satisfactory conditions for the winter crops to form grain and bloom.

Over a large part of the USSR's European territory the early spring grain crops showed stalk growth. They were forming ears south of the Riga-Smolensk-Orel-Tambov-Uralsk line. In the southern, central, and eastern regions of the Ukraine, over a large part of Rostov and eastern Volgograd Oblasts, and in Astrakhan Oblast the spring barley was forming grain, and in the extreme eastern Ukraine, Rostov Oblast, and a number places in the Northern Caucasus it achieved the stage of gold ripeness 10 days earlier than the annual average.

The cool and rainy weather was favorable for the formation of ears of early spring grain crops. The condition of the crops in the majority of the regions is good. The height of the spring barley at the stage of milky ripeness was 75-95 cm, and in places it was 100-110 cm. However downpours (in some places with hail and squalls) increased the acreage of fallen crops, which may lead to harvest losses. In many fields the plants have been damaged by agricultural pests and diseases.

The moisture supply for the crops is good almost everywhere. Individual weather stations have conducted the first determination of the weight of the root crop. In Kirovograd, Poltava, and Cherkassy Oblasts its weight equals 40-80 g.

In the agricultural regions of Western Siberia and Krasnoyarsk Kray and in southwestern Irkutsk Oblast and Kazakhstan (except for the western regions), where hot weather stayed for most of the 10-day period, the average air temperature for the 10-day period exceeded the annual average by two to six degrees, and in the rest of the regions of Eastern Siberia and in western Kazakhstan it was close to the average.

In Western Siberia and in the extreme north of Kazakhstan the winter crops bloomed, and in the forest-steppe zone they formed ears. The hot weather without significant precipitation along with insufficient stores of moisture in the soil observed for a long time in southern Novosibirsk Oblast, the steppe regions of Altay Kray, and northern Semipalatinsk and East Kazakhstan Oblasts will lead to a reduction in the grain content of the ear. The condition of wheat and rye here are only satisfactory. In the more northern regions the supply of moisture is sufficient, and the condition of the plants is good to satisfactory. The early spring grain crops have reached the stage of tillering, stem extension, and appearance of the lower nodule of culm. They have been observed forming ears (tasseling) in Ural Oblast. As a result of the hot dry weather which has stayed on in the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan, the supply of moisture for the early spring grain crops has continued to worsen almost everywhere. It is unsatisfactory to bad in a number of the southern agricultural regions of Siberia.

Very hot weather was observed in the republics of Central Asia. The average temperature for the 10-day period was 25-33 degrees, which is three to four degrees higher than the annual average. Conditions for the growth and development of cotton for most of the 10-day period were favorable for the most part. However on fields with insufficient moistening the increased air temperatures (40-44 degrees) hampered the plants severely and there may be shedding of the flowering elements. Over a large part of the territory the cotton has been noted accumulating buds, and the first flowers have appeared in the south. The winter barley has achieved complete ripeness, and its harvest is being completed. Only in some places in Kirghizia is it finishing the formation of grain. The winter wheat has also ripened over a large part of the territory, and it continues to form grain in Kirghizia.

Scientific

Cosmonauts Continue Experiments 26 Jun

LD2606130790 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—After the specialised Kristall module arrived in the orbit and docked with the Mir orbital station, Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyov and Aleksandr Balandin have their hands full. They are now focusing on geophysical research and experiments with different materials in space.

Different parts of the earth's surface have been photographed to obtain data on areas promising for natural wealth prospectors.

The Tsvet-1T videospectrometer was used in a series of experiments to improve methods of identifying sea areas rich in plankton.

Cosmonauts have tested the operation of a new technological installation, Optizon, designed to study the process of producing silicon monocrystals in weightlessness, using a new zonal melting procedure. Samples of materials are heated by a focused energy of three electric light sources.

In the afternoon today, the Krater-B installation will melt a sample to obtain semi-conducting zinc-oxide.

Two series of astrophysical experiments are scheduled for today during which the C+Lazar-2 [as received] telescope will register ultraviolet radiation from specific areas in the eagle constellation.

Work is proceeding as scheduled on board the Mir complex. The cosmonauts are feeling fine.

Space Engineering To Survey Environment

LD2606132490 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] At the initiative of Soviet parliamentarians, space engineering has begun to be used in working out new environmental protection programs. According to experts, a five-minute space survey yields data a plane can master only in two seasons. Space surveys will serve as the basis of recommendations for improving the ecological situation in industrialized areas. Soviet space surveys have been sold to Japan, the United States, West Germany, France, and Italy. They are used in studying natural resources and in spotting plantations of drug yielding crops in Latin America.

Military

Gorbachev, Yazov at Military Academy Reception

Honor Graduates

LD2606172790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] A traditional annual reception in honor of the graduates of military academies was given in St. George's Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace today. The future of our Army, and its present-day state, are on the minds of the public and the people's deputies of the country. The problems linked to this have been discussed at the Supreme Soviet's session more than once.

Today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev attended the reception for the first time in his capacity as president of the country. The reception was also attended by members of the Presidential Council, members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, leaders of the Ministry of Defense, and Soviet military commanders.

[Correspondent V. Stepanyuk, identified by caption] The Soviet Armed Forces and the officers' corps of our country are getting a considerable reinforcement today, Marshal Yazov said, opening the reception. After completing education, the academy gradutates of 1990 are joining divisions, vessels, staffs, or military higher educational establishments. Naturally, the fate of the forthcoming military reform and the process of renewal in our Armed Forces in general will depend, to a great degree, on their knowledge and professional skills. Addressing the graduates, professors, and lecturers, and also the officers of friendly armies who have graduated from Soviet military academies, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, among other things: [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Addresses Graduates

LD2606115990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Address by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev to military academy graduates in the Georgiyevskiy Hall of the Kremlin Palace on 26 June—recorded]

[Text] Dear comrades! Esteemed representatives of friendly states! Today, according to the established tradition, we are honoring the officers of the Soviet Armed Forces and of the Armies of foreign countries who have graduated from military academies. This is always an event, and not only for those who are completing their training. It is always an event for our Army, an event for the whole of our country. So, may I first of all greet all of you heartily and congratulate all the graduates on the completion of their training. I wish you success on the difficult but noble path of service to your people and to your fatherland which you have chosen. [applause]

You are departing from the precincts of the academies at a time which is exceptionally dynamic, one which one could say, and we are already saying, is a watershed. The world community has approached a decisive boundary, and an historic chance has emerged to eliminate the threat of self-destruction and to bring the resolution of very acute global problems and contradictions, which have called the very survival of mankind into question, into a civilized framework. This has now been recognized. Even yesterday programs concerning this were called illusions, but today this is already real policy and real practice.

Achievement of this aim is possible only in conditions that maintain and strengthen the international balance of interests, the all-around considered reduction of the level of confrontation between blocs and between states and then the overcoming of it. The utmost level of interdependence of all parts of today's world demands radical improvement of relations between countries and peoples. Responding to the challenge of the times, the Soviet Union has embarked on a path of profound renewal in all spheres of public life. We have arrived at a critically important boundary of change, probably the most important change since October 1917. Overcoming the consequences of the grave distortions in the past, and freeing ourselves from some of the errors made in past years, now in the years of perestroyka a modern civil society and a law-governed state are being formed step by step. The assertion of the new is not proceeding without pain, you can see all of this and feel the effects for yourselves. We have to bear the costs and the losses. But, as they say in the military, there is no retreat. There is no solution to be found behind us, in a return to the past, for the problems and matters of principle which arise from life itself, posed by reality itself. On the contrary, we can seek and find answers to them only by stepping up our forward movement, acting naturally, with the greatest sense of responsibility to our people and to the whole of the world community, taking into account the role played by the Soviet Union in our times.

Now, in the run-up to the 28th CPSU Congress, the diversity of public activity by various social groups and strata of our society, and their commitment to renewal of the political system and of all institutions of state power and government, are being particularly clearly manifested. The country's security must of course be ensured in response to the profound changes in this country and the world. In our time, it is more important than ever before to take a broad and thorough account of all factors in that security: military, political, economic and diplomatic. The understanding of the dynamic interdependence of all these factors is today perhaps no longer the algebra but the alphabet of security. Politicians, diplomats, and military figures are not and cannot be realistically thinking and literate unless they have mastered this alphabet.

In bringing its actions into accord with changing global realities, the Soviet state makes a universally recognized contribution to improving the international situation, first and foremost in Europe, where the unprecedented concentration of the most up-to-date weapons and the strongest military confrontation are among the unique and remarkable aspects which must still be borne in mind. These are also the realities of present-day Europe.

The conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states, which recently took place in Moscow, advocated that this very year the nature and functions of the treaty should be reviewed in the spirit of contemporary political thinking and defence doctrine. The international public today has the right to expect and demand a process in response on the part of the North Atlantic Alliance. Substantial changes in military doctrine and all activities of NATO which were engendered by the cold war are essential for real progress towards a new, pan-European system of security. Such a system as this might best guarantee the maintenance of international equilirium and fruitful, peaceful interaction.

The Soviet Union submitted for consideration to the European states, the United States and Canada a whole series of specific and constructive proposals aimed at strengthening the Helsinki process and creating new institutions for European cooperation. This cooperation can be organically linked with solution of the foreign policy aspects of the unification of the GDR and FRG, which should take far-sighted account of the legitimate interests of its neighbors and of all Europeans, including, of course, the Germans themselves. We believe such an approach would make it possible to attain a sufficiently reliable level guaranteeing confidence, stability, and prosperity in all of Europe. This, in view of its importance in world politics, would stimulate and accelerate the positive changes in other regions and on the global level as a whole.

Following the principles of equal security and the maintenance of strategic stability, the USSR has a close interest in advancing towards a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. Preventing war and reliably ensuring defense sufficiency—that is the essence of the new Soviet military doctrine. This is also the purpose of our military policy, which is distinguished by increasing openness and readiness for new forms of international cooperation in the realm of ensuring security.

The Soviet leadership is doing, and will be doing, everything necessary for our Army and Navy to be strong, meeting the highest modern requirements in military practice and theory. No one should have any doubt about that. When I say no one, this means no one in our country, or beyond its borders. We are decisively and consistently ridding ourselves of the elements of dogmatism and routine which, once having affected our defence-building, too, was not without cost to it, and, of course, to the whole country.

Work upon the concept of military reform is in its final stage: The draft will be considered in the USSR Supreme Soviet. Today's graduates of the military academies, each at his post, will have to directly implement and take charge of putting into practice the designs and ideas of the military reform.

Without a doubt, the imminent reorganization of the Armed Forces will affect the destinies of many people. The problem of improving the conditions of the daily life and work of servicemen, which has built up over decades, is not at the center of attention for the country's leadership. The government has prepared a package of specific, practical measures encompassing all aspects of social protection for people who have entwined their lives with the Army and Navy. First and foremost, the basis in law for doing active military service is being considerably strengthened, as is that for social security for servicemen and their families. Major material and financial resources are being allocated specifically for this, including particularly for building housing. The corresponding state probem is calculated over a five-year period. Appropriations will amount to several thousand million rubles per year. They will increase as economic development stabilizes and improves.

The state and society are obliged to do everything necessary for the Army to be continually aware of the concern and support of the people. In a country renewing itself, the slogan 'The people and Army are one,' should have real content and capability.

Comrades, in a few days you will be leaving academies within whose walls you have acquired fundamental theoretical and practical skills in managing units, vessels, and formations. But the completion of studies at an academy is merely one of the stages on the way to real professional mastery. The main, and perhaps the most difficult, task ahead is to prove in your daily work your right to the mandate of trust placed in you by the state and the people.

Life does not stand still. Equipment and weaponry grow more advanced and complex. Troops acquire highly accurate combat equipment, complex automated systems, and radio-electronic systems. But the sphere of interrelations in military collectives is becoming even more complex. At this complex time it is especially important not to lose true moral and political guidelines and to be closer to one's subordinates, to know and understand their needs, to take care of them, not lessening but increasing professional demands, to persistently strengthen military brotherhood and to work skillfully with people. The steady strengthening of conscious military discipline is especially important now, under the conditions of glasnost, democratization, of dynamic change and at times even of the exacerbation of socioeconomic processes in the country. I want to stress that on the whole the Soviet Armed Forces today worthily and honorably carry out the tasks placed before them. Where the situations are most difficult, where they are complex, the military man goes—to the territories that suffered from the Chernobyl accident, to the earthquake regions of Armenia. Everywhere where courage, endurance and steadfastness are needed, our officers and soldiers are to be found in the front line. At the price of their own health, at times even of their lives, real patriots bring selfless help and protection to those who need them. During recent years hundreds of servicemen have been conferred with high-ranking state awards for their exemplary fulfilment of military and civic duties. At the same time, it would not be right to deny or diminish a number of really serious negative phenomena in Army life which should be decisively and thoroughly wrestled with, first and foremost by the military collectives themselves, and of cqurse in the first place by officers who should set an example of irreproachable, personal conduct, of great responsibility and initiative. I think issues of life in the Army, the protection of the honor and dignity of servicemen, and military and patriotic education are exhorting today's graduates. I must say a few words of acknowledgement and gratitude to the commanders, political workers, the professorial and teaching staff and all who have invested their rich experience, intellect, heart and soul in the training and education of the new Soviet officers. This is an exceptionally responsible and creative task. The modern Soviet officer is called to carry on the best traditions, and at the same time, to learn to find nonstandard solutions for qualitatively new tasks, to be able to orient himself correctly in the new internal-political and international conditions and realities, to constantly raise the level of his general culture, and to be answerable for the reliable defense of the peaceful labor of the people in the dynamically changing conditions on the threshold of the 21st century.

On this festive day I would also like to greet the officers of the friendly armies who have graduated from Soviet military academies, and wish them beneficial work in the interests of preserving peace on earth and in strengthening links between our states.

I express my confidence that the graduates of the academy will carry out their military and civil duty with honor, and will make a worthy contribution to our country's defensive might and the successful solution of the vital and complicated tasks of renewing the Soviet socialist state.

Farewell, comrade officers. I wish you great success in your martial labor. [applause]

Yazov Rebuts 'Concessions'

*PM2606195390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5*

[Interview with Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, by unidentified correspondent; date and place unspecified; under "Interview Before the 28th CPSU Congress" rubric: "Responsibility for the Motherland's Fate"—]

[Text] [PRAVDA] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, it is almost four and a half years since the 27th CPSU Congress, which adopted fundamentally important resolutions in the sphere of the country's defense and security. Today, on the eve of the party's 28th congress, how would you assess everything that has been achieved in this area over the past few years?

[Yazov] Essentially, the 27th party congress fleshed out and translated into practical policy the ideas of new thinking put forward a year earlier by the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum and reinforced the qualitatively new course in the sphere of the country's defense and security. The stereotype borne of decades of the "cold war" imposed on the world by international reaction was overcome. In order to prevent a new war and maintain peace we had to achieve military-strategic parity with the United States. This extremely difficult task was resolved. But we were drawn into an arms race. Analysis has shown that some of our steps toward parity could have been different and not necessarily symmetrical. We also underestimated the political, economic, diplomatic, and other possibilities for safeguarding security.

The new defensive military doctrine was worked out soon after the 27th party congress and announced in May 1987 on the basis of the analysis that was done and a comprehensive assessment of the correlation of forces and the state of and prospects for world development.

[PRAVDA] In this regard did the Western mass media make immediate attempts to present it simply as a "propaganda act"?

[Yazov] Yes, this campaign was extensively launched, and its echoes can often be heard even now. Although, I would recall, we proposed from the very outset holding consultations aimed at comparing Warsaw Pact and NATO military doctrines, analyzing their nature, and jointly examining the thrust of their further evolution. A seminar on these questions was only held in Vienna almost three years later.

By then we had already made major practical steps to materialize the new doctrine. Among the most important of these were the asymmetrical reduction of two classes of missile. Concluding the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles with the United States, we agreed—and this wholly accords with the long-term security interests of our country and of world peace—to destroy over twice as many missiles (1,846 as against 846) and almost 3.4 times as many warheads (1,487 as against 442). The treaty has currently been wholly fulfilled in terms of shorter-range missiles, and, as far as intermediate-range missiles are concerned, it has been more than 80 percent fulfilled by the Soviet side and 53 percent fulfilled by the U.S. side.

[PRAVDA] Incidentally, about asymmetrical cuts. There continue to be statements in the West that the United States and NATO have allegedly succeeded in wringing concessions from the Soviet Union on disarmament issues exclusively thanks to their "hard" line. What can you say on that score?

[Yazov] These are relapses of a chronic illness whose diagnosis is military strong-arm thinking. Nobody is allowed to talk to us from a position of strength. In general, the gamble on force has always been a catalyst for confrontation. But whereas in the past, provoking rivalry in the military sphere, it led to tragedies following which the peoples were still able to rectify matters, nowadays such a gamble would be a direct route to an irreversible general human catastrophe.

That is why the Soviet Union is pursuing its consistent peace-loving course. From this stem our initiatives and bold decisions, which some people see—quite without foundation—as "concessions to the West." These decisions include, in particular, the agreement on the asymmetrical scrapping of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. This was essentially a breakthrough to practical nuclear disarmament. It was necessary to expand its borders and spread the disarmament process to other kinds of weapons. That was when we adopted a new initiative—to unilaterally cut our Armed Forces by 500,000 men, 10,000 tanks, 8,500 artillery systems, and 820 combat aircraft. Announced by M.S. Gorbachev at the United Nations, it met with an enormous international response. To all intents and purposes, the Soviet Union had opened up a new era in human history—the movement from super-armament to sufficiency for defense.

Incidentally, in yesterday's PRAVDA article E.A. Shevardnadze quite rightly noted that all decisions to cut armed forces and armaments are thoroughly worked out with the participation of all interested departments. There is not a single issue in this sphere that is not coordinated with the Defense Ministry.

Returning to the resolution on the half-million cut, it must be said that it is being consistently carried out. Our troop numbers have already fallen by almost 300,000. Bearing in mind additional measures to transfer formations and units to the defensive structure in groups of forces and military districts, in total in the European part of the USSR more than 15,800 tanks, around 21,300 artillery systems, more than 860 combat aircraft, 40 warships, and a considerable amount of other hardware has been cut.

To this it can be added that as of 20 December last year we have unilaterally withdrawn 500 (166 airborne, 50 artillery, and 284 missile) tactical nuclear warheads. And we are prepared to go further—to remove all nuclear munitions from our allies' territory—given a similar step on the part of the United States, of course.

Under the bilateral agreements with Czechoslovakia and Hungary we are also withdrawing our troops from those countries according to plan. Around 40,000 men, almost 900 tanks, more than 1,000 armored fighting vehicles, more than 600 artillery systems, and over 120 warplanes and helicopters have already returned home. Moreover, our troops are being withdrawn from Mongolia.

All these are components of the transformation of our Armed Forces in line with the defensive doctrine.

[PRAVDA] What other measures, apart from those you have mentioned, could also be considered most important in the implementation of the new doctrine?

[Yazov] Above all, the measures to reorganize the Armed Forces' structure. Here too a great deal has been done in recent years. In particular, two military district directorates have been abolished by unifying the Central Asian and Turkestan Military Districts, and the Volga and Urals Military Districts. Directorates have also been disbanded in 2 combined-arms armies and 5 army corps, 21 combined-arms divisions, and a number of formations and units of other branches of the Armed Forces and categories of troops.

[PRAVDA] How would you assess these measures from the standpoint of the country's defense capability and the Armed Forces' combat readiness?

[Yazov] Therein lies the complexity and the responsibility of the current, largely crucial, phase of defense building. Throughout this period, at a time of radically reduced appropriations, cuts in military production, and the fundamental reorganization of the Army and Navy, we are obliged to maintain their combat readiness at the necessary level and to guarantee the country's reliable defense capability.

There is one way out—to ensure that quality gets priority in practice. Both in defense building as a whole and in the Armed Forces—in their makeup, structure, technical equipment, personnel training, military science, and the resolution of social, cultural, and consumer tasks.... As you know, this was the decision of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. That is the point of military reform and of the entire perestroyka policy in the defense sphere.

[PRAVDA] You have talked about military reform in "conjunction" with perestroyka. What is the relationship between them?

[Yazov] Military reform is part of perestroyka, one of the necessary components of the process of renewing our society and organically including it in a system of international relations based on the priority of common human values. Moreover, it is only possible in the political, economic, legal, and spiritual context of perestroyka.

All major military reform measures, including those we have mentioned, are carried out according to the decisions of our country's top organs of power. Comprehensive research on the foreign-policy, socioeconomic, scientific, technical, legal, and other aspects of military reform continues in parallel with the fulfillment of specific practical tasks. Its conceptual foundations are laid down by contemporary policy in the sphere of the country's defense and security and by the defensive military doctrine.

[PRAVDA] Could you just say a few words about those foundations, Dmitriy Timofeyevich? Admittedly, you have already set out in detail the concept of military reform, not least in our newspaper. However, as certain press articles and features in the other mass media show, a number of writers sometimes display astonishing ignorance. So underlining a few things once again would probably be no bad thing.

[Yazov] You're probably right. I will just mention the main point. The aim of military reform is to ensure high efficiency in defense building with minimal expenditure of funds and resources. To this end, military production and its infrastructure must be restructured and brought within the limits of reasonable sufficiency; the composition, organizational and manning structure, equipment, and training of the Armed Forces must be optimized; the legislative basis of defense building and the functioning of the Army and Navy must be brought into line with the demands of a socialist rule-of-law state; and an effective system of legal and social protection of servicemen and their families must be created.

[PRAVDA] On what does the pace of the spread of military reform depend?

[Yazov] On many factors, both internal and external. In particular, on overcoming the current socioeconomic instability and crisis situations in interethnic relations, on the results of the restructuring of military production and its conversion, and on the resolution of social problems. But can reform measures really be abstracted from current military-political realities? After all, as the facts attest, the West is in no great hurry to abandon a whole series of stereotypes and dogmas of the "cold war" period. Military building in the United States and NATO continues to be based on the scenarios of "nuclear deterrence," "direct confrontation," and "flexible response."

Despite the statements by U.S. and NATO leaders about possible cuts in military spending, troops, and armaments, in practice little is being done in this direction. All the main military programs previously adopted are being implemented in full.

Responsibility for the fate of the motherland requires that we objectively assess and take full account of all this in implementing military reform and transforming the Armed Forces.

[PRAVDA] You once called the transformation of the Armed Forces the nucleus and core of all military reform. How do you envision it in the future?

[Yazov] In recent months we have held a number of enlarged sessions of the Defense Ministry Collegium, at which there was a very acute debate on this topic. Many issues still remain open. We will have to resolve them, remove the contradictions, work through them once again, and take account of a number of interesting proposals. Active cooperation on all aspects of defense building and Armed Forces development is coordinated with the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions.

We can already see quite clearly the future outlines of our Armed Forces as a socialist, multinational, extraterritorial [eksterritorialnyy] cadre army staffed on a mixed volunteer-draft basis and meeting the requirements of reasonable and reliable sufficiency for defense.

[PRAVDA] Are changes to the system for staffing the Armed Forces envisaged?

[Yazov] Staffing questions are closely bound up with the geostrategic position, the level of economic development, the country's financial potential, the real size of defense tasks facing it, the existence of draft resources, and so forth. It is by no means accidental that the overwhelming majority of modern armies are staffed on the mixed principle, combining universal military service and the volunteer system. This is more economical and effective from the standpoint of ensuring a sufficient level of defense readiness and the accumulation of mobilization resources.

Our Armed Forces are also staffed on this principle. Approximately one-third of their manpower are people who have voluntarily chosen military service as their profession—officers, warrant officers, ensigns, and certain other categories of servicemen. It is they who occupy key posts from the standpoint of combat readiness.

[PRAVDA] Everything is clear with regard to the situation of officers. They are people who, as a rule, choose the military profession once and for all. But the categories of warrant officers, ensigns, and volunteers for extended service are more in keeping with a "contract" system of manning. What does our experience tell us in this respect?

[Yazov] I would cite certain statistics and you can draw your own conclusions. In the groups of forces where salaries are higher these categories of servicemen account for 64-82 percent of the staffing of regular [shtatnyy] posts. In the military districts of the southwestern parts of the country they account for 30-40 percent, and in remote areas with special climatic conditions they account for just 14-15 percent. In the Polar Region and Kamchatka, where higher-rate privileges have been established, they account for approximately 32 percent. Manning by contract would seriously impede matters.

I think that there are things to think about here for those who campaign for an immediate and incautious switch to a "professional" Army—that is, an Army fully staffed on the basis of volunteers.

We are studying the system of "contract" staffing. Within the framework of the reform it is planned to stage an experiment as of next year. The question of changing the staffing system will be decided on the basis of the results obtained and other research.

[PRAVDA] What can be said about the calls currently being heard in certain regions for the creation of "national formations" and "national armies"?

[Yazov] From the military standpoint this would be a retrograde step liable to destroy [razrushit] the Army's combat readiness and the country's defense capability. From the economic and technical standpoint it is a bluff, and I think that people will realize why. From the political standpoint it raises the threat of interethnic contradictions being channeled into fratricidal conflicts.

[PRAVDA] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, the problems of social protection for servicemen have become exacerbated recently. How are they being resolved in the context of military reform?

[Yazov] This is one of reform's priority directions. A great deal has already been done. Pensions have been increased. Officers' salaries have been increased and a system of payments and compensation introduced. A targeted statewide social program has been elaborated whose implementation will make it possible to radically improve the situation.

Currently the situation is very difficult. More than 173,000 servicemen have no apartments, and another 25,000 will be added to that number with the troop withdrawals from Czechoslovakia and Hungary. I cannot fail to mention that the situation is exceptionally complicated by the failure of local organs of power to fulfill the government resolution on providing servicemen with housing. Throughout the country as a whole local executive committees [ispolkoms] are currently short of 24,500 apartments for cadre servicemen and around 30,000 for officers and warrant officers discharged to the reserve.

The Defense Ministry has been focusing all its efforts and all the funds at its disposal on solving the housing problem. But we will need help from the union republics, ministries, and departments in shipments of material resources for housing construction. Despite the planned 50-percent increase in our own enterprises' production of the necessary output, we will only be able to meet 75 percent of the construction needs. We have been forced to appeal to Union and republic Supreme Soviets to rule that Union republics, in accordance with the current quota, each annually allocate 500,000 square meters of housing for cadre servicemen in 1991-2000. Only in this event can the housing problem be resolved for servicemen in the way envisaged by all-Union programs.

[PRAVDA] Life attests that not only the social protection of servicemen but their legal protection as well needs strengthening.

[Yazov] Undoubtedly. And in this area we need urgent measures, since in a number of parts of the country—above all, the Baltic, the Transcaucasus, Moldavia, and the western oblasts of the Ukraine—illegal actions are committed against servicemen with the connivance, and sometimes the direct participation, of local authorities. The Army's history, traditions, problems, and difficulties are turned into objects of irresponsible political speculation—not without help from some of the mass media. Anticonstitutional acts are undertaken to provoke rejection of military service and encourage desertion. A boycott of the USSR law on universal military service has been organized.

All this influences officers' moral state and morale much more than any domestic discomforts or adversity, and leads to a fall-off in the prestige of the officer corps.

[PRAVDA] What is being done to strengthen legal protection for servicemen?

[Yazov] Within the framework of the military reform a range of legislative acts is being elaborated, including laws on defense, universal military service, the legal status of servicemen, the position as regards military service by different categories of servicemen, and others. An important task is to ensure that the law is paramount in the activities of military administration organs, to further develop the legal service, and to organize universal legal education in the Army and Navy. On the whole, the duties and responsibility not only of the Armed Forces but of state organs, social organizations, officials, and citizens should be clearly defined and reinforced in law so as to resolve the tasks of the country's defense and security.

[PRAVDA] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, what do you expect from the 28th party congress?

[Yazov] Above all, consolidation and the cohesion of communists and our entire society. A profound and businesslike discussion of problems, including those which we are discussing with you. I am sure that the party forum's collective reason will be able to find the right approaches to resolving the tasks of renewing our society, improving the people's life, and strengthening the might of our motherland—the USSR.

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 26 June Supreme Council

Tax Law Debated

LD2606085190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 26 June carries a relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

Deputies Kuzmickas and Abisalas are in the chair. The presenter states that so far there have been eight proposals concerning the moratorium and today's debate would deal with this topic.

At 0701 GMT Deputy Abisalas proposes today's agenda, stating that the most important item should be debates on the moratorium, but there are also other issues to be discussed first, and proposes to deal first with the draft law on taxes.

At 0707 GMT the agenda is approved by a majority of votes.

At 0710 GMT Deputy Rudys presents a report on the draft law on state taxes.

At 0724 GMT there are questions and proposals concerning tax inspectorates.

At 0731 GMT debates on individual paragraphs in the draft law take place. The first two paragraphs in the law are adopted.

At 0700 GMT a vote was taken on the third paragraph in the law. It is adopted without being read. Debates on other paragraphs continue. A lively debate takes place on the procedure for tax inspectors to check whether private dwellings are not rented and whether this is declared in tax returns.

At 0823 GMT it is decided to postpone the debate and ask Rev. Alfonsas Svarinskas to address the Supreme Council. He describes his visits to other parliaments in western countries and his impressions during the proclamation of Lithuanian independence on 11 March. According to him, Lithuanians are respected in the world. Calling for unity among the Lithuanians, he expresses the opinion that the 11 March act is inviolable.

At 0837 GMT an interval is declared until 0905 GMT.

Tax Evasion Penalities Urged

LD2606104990

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0905 GMT on 26 June resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius following the announced break.

The announcer states that this morning the deputies were greeted in front of the Supreme Council building by a picket which demanded that the 11 March independence act should not be suspended. She also describes Rev. Svarinskas, who addressed the council, as a fighter for Lithuania's independence.

At 0907 GMT debates on the draft law on taxes continue.

At 0915 GMT there is no quorum; vote cannot be taken on the draft law. Deputy Abisalas announces that the issue of the moratorium will be discussed in the afternoon as the last item on the agenda.

At 0919 GMT debates on the draft law on state taxes continue.

At 0932 GMT voting takes place on a paragraph dealing with sanctions for failure to pay taxes. It is not clear how the deputies voted. Other paragraphs adopted.

At 0935 GMT a vote is taken on the whole draft law and is passed by a majority of votes. The law will come into force on 1 July.

At 0938 GMT Deputy Sadreika makes proposals on the introduction of fines and criminal responsibility for various instances of tax avoidance and failure to submit correct tax returns.

At 0948 GMT Deputy Sadreika answers questions concerning his proposals.

At 0950 GMT proposals are also made on amendments to the Criminal Code. Amendments to individual paragraphs are briefly discussed. There are no objections or remarks.

AT 0957 GMT a vote is taken on amendments and they are adopted by a majority of vote.

At 1001 GMT the next item on the agenda is draft regulations of the Supreme Council. A detailed report is made on this issue.

At 1035 GMT an interview is declared until 1200 GMT.

Landsbergis Speaks

LD2606173190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1200 GMT on 26 June resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius following the announced break.

Deputy Taurantas continues his report on the draft regulations of the Supreme Council. He describes more than 17 sections and 180 paragraphs in the draft regulations and reads an article on the setting up of factions in the Supreme Council.

At 1234 GMT Deputy Abisalas says the deputies who wish to speak about the regulations should pay their attention only to basic matters and make corresponding proposals. Debates take place.

At 1336 GMT a vote is taken to approve the first reading of draft regulations and later start the procedure of adopting the regulations. The deputies decide to continue the examination of this issue next Tuesday.

At 1344 GMT an interval is declared until 1415 GMT.

At 1415 GMT the live relay resumes. The presenter states that Prime Minister Prunskiene and many members of the government are present. Landsbergis has also returned from Moscow. He will probably make a report, but he is not ready yet.

At 1416 GMT a report is given on the draft nature protection law.

At 1420 GMT the draft law on environmental protection is presented.

At 1427 GMT the report on the draft law ends, and questions by the deputies begin. At this point the radio presenter announces that V. Landsbergis has now entered the hall and taken his place among the other deputies.

At 1430 GMT questions to deputy Vebra begin. Reception deteriorates to unmonitorable.

At 1441 GMT Deputy Abisalas proposes postponing debates on the issue under discussion and go over to political problems.

At 1444 GMT Landsbergis takes the floor to report on his visit to Moscow.

He says that throughout the whole past period everything has been directed toward the possibility of solving the conflict. He says both sides are making efforts to reach a solution to the problem.

Following this, Landsbergis outlines all the steps the republic has taken so far. He also says that the republic has withstood all kinds of threats and intimidation from the Soviet Union and now the position has changed: Lithuania is no longer asked to accept the impossible, that is, to rescind the Act of Independence. Now, says Landsbergis, Moscow has indicated that they are better disposed toward Lithuania; more understanding is shown.

In addition, Landsbergis says that although Lithuania is now prepared to show positive reaction to this changed disposition, guarantees on the part of the Soviet Union after the declaration of the moratorium should still be given.

Following this, Landsbergis speaks in general terms about all the draft proposals made by the government and the presidium of the Supreme Council concerning the moratorium on the Act of Independence. Landsbergis discusses the proposals for a moratorium. He says that one of the proposals was that a moratorium should be declared only on some articles in the Act of Independence, thus saving those parts of the act which are most important to us.

Another question is the timing of the moratorium, that is, when the moratorium should be declared. He says that first the objects of negotiations should be given legal definition, that is, a Soviet Union which still includes the republic of Lithuania in its composition or the Soviet Union and the republic of Lithuania and not the Lithuanian SSR (Soviet Socialist Republic).

Landsbergis Continues

LD2606175790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1513 GMT on 26 June continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. Landsbergis continues his report on the visit to Moscow, and says that it is clear that with the present distribution of political forces in the Soviet Union, any attempt to make the act of this nature null and void would not be successful.

Speaking of today's meeting with Gorbachev, Landsbergis says that it was a rather friendly meeting. Although some pressure could be felt, Gorbachev listened to all explanations and later read all the eight proposed variants rather carefully so that he could be acquainted with the situation at first hand.

Landsbergis goes on to say that Gorbachev pointed out to him that Lithuania is moving forward while disregarding the changing situation within the Soviet Union. He also spoke about the restructuring of the Soviet Union.

Following this, Landsbergis says that they discussed what would happen if the situation remains as it is in Lithuania. He says that two hours later, after the meeting, Gorbachev made a phone call to Vilnius asking for more proposals. He also gave his view on the results of the meeting. The phone call was made to Prime Minister Prunskiene, and therefore Landsbergis asks her to make a report on this later. He says that this proves that the situation in Moscow is constantly changing; it shows that Moscow is aware that maintaining its position is not possible and that trying to force Lithuania to change its demands to fit what Moscow wants will not work. Both sides should be ready to make concessions in their demands.

At this point Landsbergis says that, in his opinion, the parliament should debate the eight proposals today but restrain from taking a vote on any of them.

At 1535 GMT Landsbergis concludes his address and accepts questions from the floor.

Prunskiene Reports

LD2606191190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1538 GMT on 26 June, in a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius, carries remarks by Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimieras to the council on President Vytautas Landsbergis 26 June talks with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow.

After taking the floor, Prunskiene says that the main goal at the moment is to reinforce the declaration of independence, to make it work in practical terms. She says Western states and those in the Eastern bloc have, without reservation, expressed their opinion that, although they support Lithuania's aspirations, they believe Lithuania should first sort out things with Moscow. Therefore, she says, unpleasant as it may be, we must first solve the problem with the Soviet Union.

Speaking of the danger inherent in declaring the moratorium, she says that she does not see any danger. For example, she says, we may not even go to the negotiations table if the conditions are not acceptable to us.

Here are the principal statements, Prunskiene says, which President Gorbachev has asked me to relay to the parliament. This is what I am going to tell you. I do not think it will be far from the truth to say that I feel our delegation today, led by the chairman, has accomplished a truly serious [passage indistinct]. In listening to this [passage indistinct]. It is apparent that following this meeting, the Lithuanian position had been discussed and apparently, certain amendments had been adopted, within the Soviet Union's position, perhaps to the last limit. Most probably. Thus, the moratorium is approved, according to the interpretation stated by President Gorbachev, which was set out by me. But, you, perhaps, have heard that I did not go into that interpretation very much, that it does not concern the validity of that act, while this touches upon the utilization of opportunities. In other words, this is an effective interpretation. I do not know from whom President Gorbachev [words indistinct] according to my interpretation of the moratorium. Since otherwise this contradicts [word indistinct] the interpretation, that Chairman Landsbergis adopted.

But the other statements also [words indistinct] that is [word indistinct] the adoption of a moratorium does not signify a return to 10 March. It does not mean that. Did I hear that wrong? How could that have happened? I am amazed, since the other statements also assert the same thing. Does he talk about the formation of interstate relations? So, it is possible to arrive with proposals. Of course, they will also talk about the fact that a union of sovereign nations is being formed. He noted that eight republics have altered their proposals concerning a union agreement. Well, I asked him what about the blockade? It goes without saying, the blockade is being revoked with the acceptance of the moratorium. Bring your proposals, since we must continue to move forward. He recalled the moment, which is connected with several of our drafts, concerning the illegality of our 1940 incorporation, which would suggest the consideration, or in other words, it would require the introduction of this matter through the parliaments.

It goes without saying that if we introduce demands such as revoking the 1940 act or recognizing the illegality of this incorporation act, then the decision would fall not to the president but to congress or at least, to the parliament. He mentioned the parliament, thus hinting this would hardly be a better variant for agreement. I think this truly indicates the need to reexamine our understanding of one another and really does mean we are attuning our positions. [passage indistinct]

Supreme Soviet Chairman Lukyanov also participated in the meeting with our representatives. By the way, he also participated in our meeting with Prime Minister Ryzhkov. Finally, we also are acquainted with him as former deputies.

In other words, he indicated that he awaits this action from our side and that these intricate matters will really develop along these lines.

At 1600 GMT Prunskiene concludes her report and accepts questions from the floor.

At 1631 GMT questions to the Prime Minister end. The chairman announces that the next plenary session will be held on Thursday 28 June.

Landsbergis Addresses 26 June Supreme Council

LD2606205190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1444 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Speech by Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis at the Lithuanian Supreme Council in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] I will begin with the task entrusted to me yesterday—to review the situation which emerged while we have been striving to find a version of a certain possible statement or decision which would represent the next step in our bringing closer the positions of the Soviet Union and Lithuania.

I do not need to repeat that the aim of our political and diplomatic activity during this whole period was to alter the present collision course and the resolve the accumulated problems through negotiations. We never saw any other way and we have been striving all the time to ensure that the Soviet Union also advances along this path. [passage indistinct]

We, for our part, have made various concrete proposals and made decisions, including the latest decision adopted by the Supreme Council and the additional decision by the Council of Ministers. And after all these efforts we have seen some movement, after we withstood all the pressure, intimidation, ultimatums, and economic coercion. The Soviet Union [passage indistinct] closer positions from such an ultimatum, with which we could not comply, as the demand to rescind our 11 March documents, the demand to suspend them or stop them or proclaim a moratorium.

This step has been stated by various means. This information has been reaching us by various means. I myself have taken part in a conversation [words indistinct] which I described at the meeting of the three chairmen of the Supreme Councils of the Baltic states, and with the Soviet president. Several formulas were used there [passage indistinct]. We did not receive any proposal in the form of a document, in writing. Therefore, these statements or demands seemed to be open to various interpretations.

Therefore, although our hopes have been raised, although the Soviet Union's leadership has shown more goodwill and understanding of Lithuania's position, we had to be careful and think about what would happen if some accepted formula is later interpreted differently, interpreted in a manner detrimental to us, (?with political, psychological, and other pressure), so that we do not find ourselves in a worse or a more vulnerable position.

Therefore, first of all, thinking about the documents which should be drawn up and which we have been drawing up, we were thinking aboutv how to protect ourselves, what guarantees there would be so that the content of these documents is not unilaterally interpreted to our detriment, what guarantees could be incorporated in the documents in the form of certain legal formulas, perhaps including certain declaratory, preamble, or explanatory elements, where a statement would have a certain explanation preventing a different interpretation.

We knew that this could present difficulties for the other side, but we knew that we had to be careful because there are no guarantees in our situation, our positions, and our documents [words indistinct] not taking into consideration some verbal [word indistinct] statements or telephone conversations.

And here is the result of the work initiated by the Council of Ministers' proposal. Today we call it the first version. This was a welcome initiative because somebody had to be the first to make such a proposal. Perhaps there have been some doubts in society, by the deputies [passage indistinct]. There has been a [word indistinct] version, [passage indistinct]. This is not important. It is important that [words indistinct] the work in the commissions, in the Presidium. Lastly, we also have an eighth version submitted by the Sajudis' new Sejmas council. I know that yet another version has been prepared but it had not reached us by last night. And there is yet another rough copy, which we can call the tenth version. Thus, I would say a large package has been accumulated and this is useful.

I would not like to comment on individual projects in the decisions. Maybe the prime minister will explain the council of Ministers project in detail. I will try to sum up. [passage indistinct] I will try to (?discuss it). We know that demands have been made verbally and in the form of proposals to carry out actions which we previously did not intend to carry out when we were formulating our proposals, such as actions concerning the laws passed after 11 March or legal or other actions which stem from the 11 March act. This could be called the Kohl-Mitterrand line; it was formulated in their letter. We know that President Bush was of the same opinion. But this was not enough for the Soviet leadership.

Thus, we regarded and continue to regard it as very valuable and a very sacred matter. We also could have obtained juridical consultations and explanations that any sovereign [word indistinct] of the Lithuanian Republic and the actions of its Supreme Council, by a similarly adopted act of its sovereign will, does not [word indistinct] this sovereignty. And even if any of these acts were to be temporarily suspended, it would protect and retain its entire sovereign power in the same manner as the 16 February [word indistinct]. The 16 February [words indistinct] retained its sovereign power, in spite of all that which has transpired [words indistinct] in 1940 and during the fifty years since then. However, its [word indistinct] explanations and our experience, and not only ours, but the nation's and the public experience and that of our partners' or our opponents' [word indistinct], which obligates us to be very [word indistinct] and very cautious. Just as, undoubtedly, in our society, the conviction has been widely felt that one should not [word indistinct] (?be limited) with these acts and not to act indiscriminately, or perhaps totally, we shall be unable to continue them and also an action that cannot be taken into account.

Soon there will arise a danger—perhaps it is threatening even now—of public guilt. In spite of this, we are now considering certain, let us say, theoretical opportunities which may be familiar to the public. In turn, such deliberations have been labelled either as suspension, document [word indistinct] or a moratorium. It is reflected in these draft documents. These thoughts also and that which accumulates about these concepts. [sentence as heard]

We thought that if the Supreme Council would decide on some action of this sort, then a guarantee of a start in interstate negotiations would be the only basis [word indistinct], in other words, a suspension would go into effect only then when interstate negotiations would begin. [passage indistinct]

We were concerned especially because the public was greatly agitated and [words indistinct], a certain tene, I think, perhaps that would not last, since the tone of the moratorium concept is already evolving, which is more [word indistinct].

[Word indistinct] understandably, extension is a word that is more understandable and not so dangerous.

Perhaps it is also better in a material sense [words indistinct]. The course of these documents [passage indistinct].

There is no sense in listing these documents according to [word indistinct], right? Good, then I will state in certain (?words), in two or three, or in one draft. [passage indistinct]

If—in certain areas, authors are indicated—here and there, there exists some collective effort in those documents. Also on some of them I have added my hand. I could explain that—I did not think that I had any one document. To propose it [words indistinct] may be correct, but I saw a wider panorama for such opportunities, in order for it to be more useful to discuss them as a series of possible [word indistinct] from which we could later choose the correct one.

Thus, I will go back then, without listing these numbers, to the documents in which—in certain ones of which, it is detailed that the problems exist (?thanks to) their conceptual content and that such preliminary negotiations, with the Soviet Union would be needed [passage indistinct] I also stated earlier this [word indistinct] protection from very [words indistinct].

Now, as you can see, [word indistinct] was clear. It had been discussed, and those of you who saw the documents, it is to be suspended and is the moratorium being announced to 11 March, on a combined basis or just to include the act itself, or to [word indistinct] on that which we have discussed earlier, much time was spent [word indistinct], now another question has arisen. Its nuance is also being discussed. If our opponents set forth a demand concerning the 11 March Act, perhaps it would be useful to discuss with them whether the entire act would be deliberated or just certain of its statements, or another part that could be of importance to the other side, if [word indistinct] in its opinion, to proceed toward negotiations. An example of this is, that is, in one variant, consideration was given to the possibility of not suspending, but simply of defining a part of that act. To define a part of that act, and thus to explain on behalf of our side so that it would be acceptable both to us and to [passage indistinct]. It will be possible to [word indistinct] when the negotiations are continued further [passage indistinct].

It is declared from what point in time? One variant, from now on, as is usually done in documents, from the day of acceptance [words indistinct], another—from the start of negotiations, connected, so to speak, with interstate negotiations. These negotiation subjects should be totally clear already, in other words, the Lithuanian Republic, as a state, standing on an equal plane with the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union, as a subject that probably no longer includes Lithuania, since it would be illogical to think that Lithuania no longer exists. [Words indistinct] or some other, since these are two state subjects. Lithuania cannot negotiate with itself, while being in one and the other [word indistinct]. Thus, the defining of the subjects would be a main point. [passage indistinct]

Courses or alternatives—it is clear that deciding something from now on with so great an advance would be one [word indistinct] while joining it to negotiations, already in progress, would be a different matter.

Again, during the course of negotiations, alternative attitudes, are declared all at once, and are presented. Of course, one is selected by the government and later, yet another collective document and for this reason, the other one is considered in a defined manner.

Whichever one would last, let's say, for three months, a hundred days, or one month, as is proposed in the various drafts, after that it is continued, let the negotiations continue while the [word indistinct] lasts, if there is no [word indistinct] with the negotiations, so that the moratorium may succeed. When no benefit is derived from them, and when we are permitted to break off the negotiations, but the breaking off constitutes a certain type of negative political action. We would be relegated to an even less beneficial position, while the other side could portray itself as seeking negotiations, but that it is difficult to agree with us, while they themselves had broken off negotiations. This means they are against a solution through negotiations. Thus, we would be placed in a totally different situation, contrary to reality. That is why a guarantee that we can break off negotiations at any time is dangerous.

Well, one of them also considers the possibility of negotiations breaking off, because of conditions independent of us. If the Supreme Council did not wish to fulfill its functions in Lithuania, and so forth, in this instance, too, any act of suspension would at the same time be abated and lose its validity. This is so that no one would be able to abuse it and allow it to become automatic; in that event, we could no longer hold meetings and could no longer repeal it by our own power.

As you see, most attention has been paid to the protection of our interests. It is obvious that all of this should be defined for a period of time which—as happens in almost all of the world and is called talks about talks, or prepratory negotiations—would be followed by official interstate negotiations.

There are another two ideas reflected in some documents—the ties of the Baltic states [passage indistinct] but we must be decisive, if we take an important political step, whether we take it really independently. Of course, we inform the leaders of Latvia and Estonia. They have been informed that today we are discussing this problem and what is the state of affairs. But we could not take a decision without coordinating the positions because our decision would change the position in the Baltic alliance.

And now the idea of parity which is reflected in three documents, very thoroughly in one of them as a condition, and in others as a proposal to the Soviet Union (?to show) goodwill. If we decided to take such a step, the act of 11 March [passage indistinct].

It is obvious that in the present situation, with the present distribution of political forces in the Soviet Union, one would not succeed in annulling such an act. [passage indistinct] The situation is clearly demonstrated to the world and the public opinion when we are required [words indistinct].

And now today's meeting. It was [passage indistinct]. The explanation of our position was heard. What I have told you just now was heard, the accumulated complex of ideas, and President Gorbachev read all eight versions wishing to know the scale and volume of ideas and then to decide on his or the Soviet Union's position. And here we had to draw the conclusion that perhaps previously this position had not been clearly formulated [passage indistinct]. This gave us an impetus (?to base ourselves) on this new goodwill as regards Lithuania. [passage indistinct]

I noted that we are continuing along our path, paying little attention to the new situation developing in the Soviet Union. [Passage indistinct] how this other Soviet Union should be as a union of sovereign states and this process which has already started. The republics are examining [passage indistinct].

He stressed that the matter concerned not the consequences but the act itself. He remembers that the consequences as it was before [word indistinct] is not enough. This is not enough because his activity is limited. He cannot accept this [passage indistinct] He is tied by obligations.

I would like to [word indistinct] this situation. This is a certain objective situation, not depending much on Mikhail Gorbachev himelf. [passage indistinct] We would be seeking a solution which, according to him, we really wish to achieve. [Passage indistinct] more clarity from the Soviet Union's leadership. [passage indistinct] If we remain in the same situation as now it is essential to think whether this is good for both sides.

And what next? What next if the situation remains as it is now? Economic destruction in Lithuania! It is not isolated in this case. This is reflected also in other places. The aim, perhaps, is political destabilization in Lithuania and this destabilization would have consequences not only in Lithuania. [passage indistinct]

It is very characteristic, and the esteemed prime minister will tell you about this. She informed me that a few hours after our meeting President Gorbachev phoned her and expounded [words indistinct]. This reflects some uncertainty, perhaps, or doubt, or the political situation changing every hour in Moscow. Of course, we are also one of the factors of this political situation. The attitude toward us may worsen or improve this situation because they are still thinking. It seemed to us when we were told that the previous talks were exploratory talks, that now the position has crystallized and it is being explained, and this position does not move. As it was said there, we have somewhat moved toward encounter, and the Soviet Union has moved toward the rapprochement of positions. Now it is standing at this limit and the remaining distance has to be covered by us. But when we propose to take half a step [passage indistinct]. One should patiently work, and this other side states that it will not take another step, that it is unable [word indistinct]. But the telephone call which I mentioned, perhaps, leaves a certain frankness [word indistinct].

Anyway, the conclusion which we could reach—the esteemed prime minister will tell you about this telephone call—the conclusion we could draw was that clarity is beneficial. We are discussing here trying to [words indistinct] something, wishing to have hopes, and so on. [passage indistinct]

If this position remains here as it is, it brings a lot of clarity in our affairs, too. We in Lithuania, previously and now, and also because the economic situation is becoming more complex, are speaking in general terms only that a political maneuver, a political step, a political solution is essential which is [word indistinct] not named, as if the parliament does not wish to take some unknown political step. But now this is already known. At present everybody can occupy a clear position. [passage indistinct] But this telephone call introduces some vagueness. [passage indistinct]

I would like to propose that today we, discussing all of this and having listened to the prime minister, should not make any decision by vote. Who knows [words indistinct] tomorrow or after tomorrow. Lastly, in order for us to vote on any version, I think that from this great number of ideas we should select the most important and instruct the editorial groups or political groups to prepare alternative [passage indistinct]. But this work should be continued. [passage omitted] Some kind of document must be adopted by us, not necesarily a moratorium document, a type of a version, a statement, and so on. It is best to leave this question open. Maybe we will decide on Thursday [28 June] at the plenary sitting. Let us think about it. Thank you for your attention.

Lithuanian Parliament Opens Debate on Moratorium

AU2606111890 Paris AFP in English 1102 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Moscow, June 26 (AFP)—The Lithuanian parliamentary debate on a moratorium of its declaration of independence began Tuesday afternoon, a few hours after a surprise "private" meeting between President Vytautas Landsbergis and Mikhail Gorbachev.

The proposal for a "temporary moratorium," put forward by Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene and deputy Prime Minister Algirdas Brazauskas, has been joined by seven alternative proposals as the day's session began, the Radio Moscow INTERFAX news agency reported. The debate is expected to be sharp as differences over the conditions under which the March 11 independence declaration could be suspended has led some deputies to say they will oppose "capitulation" to the end, INTERFAX said. One of the alternative proposals demands that Moscow first recognize the nullification of the Supreme Soviet resolution of August 3, 1940 on the "entry of Lithuania" into the Soviet Union, INTERFAX said. [passage omitted]

Meanwhile, the distribution of Lithuanian citizenship certificates to parliament deputies began Monday. The distribution of these certificates was one of the first decisions taken by the parliament after proclaiming independence.

Landsbergis Assesses 'Tension' in Lithuania

LD2606142290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1300 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscilla]

[Excerpt] Vilnius, 26 Jun (TASS)—An address by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of Lithuania, was broadcast this morning on Lithuanian radio, in which he acknowleged serious difficulties in solving economic problems in the republic, and also "a great tension and uncertainty." He named "the initiators of the economic blockade" who, in his words, wanted "Lithuania to give in" as those to blame for this situation.

In his address which was, evidently, recorded earlier, Vytautas Landsbergis expressed disappointment that the outside world, while supporting the Lithaunians' desire for independence, are nonetheless watching fairly calmly as Lithuania is closed down. "It would be more understandable," he believes, "if foreign states were to protest against the injustice with regard to Lithuania."

Describing the political situation in Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis admitted that "people are arguing amongst themselves:" some are urging the Supreme Council not to take a single step, while others are expressing dissatisfactoin that the parliament is not taking such steps.

"We need to begin talks with the Soviet Union on settling mutual issues and we should move in this direction," he urges listeners.

The government's proposal on the temporary moratorium on the act of independence is being discussed today at the evening session of the Lithuanian parliament. The head of the parliament informed listeners that from ten proposed drafts, deputies will choose a few, but that it is unlikely that there will be a ballot today: "this is too complex an issue."

Assuming that "Moscow has also not exhausted possibilities for moving towards a compromise" in response to a reciprocal step by Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis predicted "a difficult struggle of maneuvers." He called on inhabitants to trust the Supreme Council. [passage omitted]

Report on Landsbergis, Prunskiene Speeches

LD2606200590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1847 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius, 26 Jun (TASS)—Lithuania's residents have waited with impatience for discussion to start on the proposal of the republic's government—included on the Supreme Soviet session's agenda—that for the duration of the talks with the Soviet Union a moratorium be declared on the act of 11 March on the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state.

Basically, the discussion has not yet begun—it was only at the end of the working day that a speech on this issue was made by Supreme Soviet Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis. Describing the government's step as "full of initiative and meriting approval" he presented a review of the ten draft documents that have been offered on this issue. At the same time he proposed that "discussion should be continued for the present."

Lithuanian Council of Ministers Chairman Prunskiene spoke on the same question. She stressed that the "declaration of a moratorium would be aimed at strengthening Lithuania's statehood and would not signify a retreat from strategic objectives." Answering deputies' questions, the head of the government expressed the desire that "talks with the Soviet Union be started before the opening of the 28th congress of the CPSU." Discussion of this important question will be continued.

Vytautas Landsbergis informed deputies about his meeting that took place today with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev. He described this as "useful, frank, even friendly, and having introduced some clarity." But at the same time he noted that the results of the conversation are not especially gladdening, since earlier both the Soviet Union and Lithuania took definite steps toward bringing their positions closer together, whereas now unilateral concessions are being required of us in order to cover the remaining distance."

Lithuanian Opposition to Moratorium 'Great'

LD2706004690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2136 GMT 26 Jun 990

[Video report from Vilnius by correspondent E. Kurkletite, identified by caption; from the "Television News Service Program presented by Yuriy Rostov]

[text] [Announcer Yuriy Rostov] One of the main events today is the debate in the Lithuanian parliament of the question of the moratorium on the Act of Independence. The debate started at the evening session. If the decision on independence is frozen, negotiations between Vilnius

and Moscow will become possible. Yesterday, Prime Minister Prunskiene spoke in support of the moratorium. Today, in the course of one and one-half hours, a meeting took place in Moscow between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Landsbergis. Among Lithuanian parliamentarians, opposition to the moratorium is fairly great.

[Kukletite] During the 100 days of independence and two months of economic blockade, the republic's inhabitants have divided into several camps. Some are prepared to suffer all adversities for the sake of independence. Others are frightened by the discomforts that are being caused by the blockade, mainly the lack of petrol and hence also the lack of motor transport. Yet others are gloating over the disagreement between the government and the parliament and are making a fortune by speculating in petrol and other goods in short supply.

Similar views were also reflected today in the deputies' debate. This is evidenced already by the fact that deputies, apart from the government variant which was submitted, had some 10 other variants of a draft moratorium submitted to them. [video shows men and women holding up posters with Lithuanian words in front of the Lithuanian Supreme Council building: proceedings in parliament, showing Prunskiene addressing session]

Lithuania, USSR Situation Still 'Unclear'

LD2606223290 Vilnius Domestic Service in English 2130 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Following [words indistinct] contacts between the Kremlin and Vilnius, the stand of the Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev concerning the possible moratorium on Lithuania's independence act for the period of talks with Moscow remains unclear. During this morning's meeting with President of Lithuania's Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis the Soviet president put forward the condition that for talks to start Lithuania should revert to the status of 10 March, that is prior to the declaration of independence.

Following exactly two hours after that meeting Mikhail Gorbachev phoned the Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene and told her that the possible moratorium on the independence pact would not mean reverting to the status of 10 March. Speaking in parliament today during the evening sitting, Kazimiera Prunskiene said that Vytautas Landsbergis' delegation had apparently done a good job. The prime minister pointed out the urgent need to make certain whether Mikhail Gorbachev's phone call indeed meant a change of the Kremlin's stand.

The meeting in the Kremlin was held at the initiative of Vytautas Landsbergis who thanked President Mikhail Gorbachev. Participating in the meeting was also Chairman of the Soviet Union's Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov, while the Lithuanian party was represented by President of the Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis, one of his deputies Ceslovas Stankevicius and envoy of the Lithuanian government in the Soviet Union, Egidijus Bickauskas.

Vytautas Landsbergis assessed the talks, which lasted for an hour and one-half as useful, frank, sincere and friendly. As to usefulness, however, it's only that more has been cleared up [words indistinct] according to Vytautas Landsbergis [word indistinct] parliament, Lithuania has taken a small step while Moscow has also taken a small step and stopped demanding that Lithuania should now go all the rest of the way to meet Moscow (?alone).

Landsbergis Told Talks Depend on Moratorium

LD2606161190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev received Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, in the Kremlin today. In the course of conversation, ways of overcoming the difficulties that have arisen in connection with the adoption by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet of a unilateral independence act were discussed. The representative of the Lithuanian leadership was told that talks on this subject could take place on the condition that a moratorium is imposed—in other words, that the act of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet of 11 March this year be suspended for the period of talks, in the general context of inter-republican dialogue on the preparation of a new union treaty and on the formation of a union of sovereign socialist states.

Comrady Lukyanov was present at the conversation.

Commentary Views Lithuanian Parliament Debate

LD2606141190 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Lithuania's Supreme Soviet is expected to begin debating on 26th June on the proposal by the republic's government to suspend the declaration of independence of 11th March. What decision will the Lithuanian parliament take?

I don't think anyone can predict the result of that debate, which is likely to be long and stormy, comments our observer Vitaliy Gurov. But the conflict has gone too far. The stumbling block is the act which proclaimed independence on 11th March. That's not a mere romantic and appealing declaration. On the one hand, it expresses the national consciousness of the Lithuanian people and their hopes for the future. On the other, there is a fair and civilized desire to place the solution of the problem on a constitutional basis. Nevertheless, the condition for opening talks between the Lithuanian Republic and the central Soviet Government is to suspend the act of independence. But initial progress made at the meetings in Moscow for providing conditions for talks has come up against strong resistance on the part of many Lithuanian parliamentarians. Some of them describe the government's proposal as capitulation. Six draft decisions have been prepared for the parliamentary session.

It's been reported from Vilnius that the League for Lithuania's Freedom organized a rally under the slogan: No talks with Moscow. That mood is widely spread in the republic. The government will find it hard to obtain a two-thirds majority for its proposal. But the opposite opinion is also popular enough. Let's note a curious detail. The latest public opinion poll has shown that the government is more popular now in the republic than the parliament. The prime minister, Kazimiera Prunskiene, and her deputy, Algirdas Brazauskas, hold the first two places for popularity. Prunskiene is twice as popular as the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Vytautas Landsbergis.

I quote these results as rather characteristic. Time shows that proclaiming attractive slogans yields few concrete achievements. But Prunskiene's cabinet is basing its activities on a realistic assessment of the current situation and real prospects of the Republic, and these prospects, particularly economic ones, are bleak and getting bleaker every day. Lithuania's isolation from the Soviet economy is telling on it more and more. They are linked not only by large arteries, as the doctors would put it, but also a multitude of capillaries. Lithuania's finance minister, Romualdas Sikorskis, has announced that in the past two months the Republic's budget has lost 100 million rubles. So it's up to the Lithuanian parliament to take the most crucial decision in the past month, whether to suspend or not the act of independence. This should determine the future of Lithuania and the Soviet Union. Will they run parallel, like two trains on two tracks, or will they collide head on?

Lithuanian Military Commissar on Enlistment

LD2706122190 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] All those who do not turn up at enlistment offices will be detained, Major-General Algimantas (Visockis), military commissar of Lithuania and a member of the Communist Party of Lithuania, CPSU platform, Central Committee, said in an interview with ELTA agency. He said: The USSR militia, procuracy, and courts have great power. I have no doubt that no one will manage to avoid military service.

Only 1,207 youths of a total of 5,800 draftees have turned up in republican military committees. Among those are 561 Lithuanians. The agency reports that renunciation of military service in the ranks of the Soviet Army is demonstrating unwillingness of the Lithuanian citizens to submit to Moscow.

The fact that paratroopers were used in an operation at a Vilnius hospital to seize Lithuanian youths refusing to serve in the country's Armed Forces had a negative effect on the moods of Lithuanian young people. It is highly unlikely that this would happen again. It is believed in Lithuania that the general has nothing else to count on. It is true, though, that not so long ago the Military Commissar of Lithuania demanded the introduction of a presidential rule in the republic.

Estonian Parliament Adopts Immigration Law

LD2706123790 Moscow TASS in English 1219 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] Tallinn June 27 TASS—By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan:

The Estonian parliament today adopted a bill on immigration. Russian-speaking deputies, who described the bill as discriminatory, refused to vote on the issue.

The new law establishes entrance quotas, introduces permanent and temporary permits for residence and regulates other matters connected with the entry and stay of foreign citizens in Estonia.

There is no quota on the entry of those who had Estonian citizenship prior to June 17, 1940 (the day Estonia joined the USSR). There is no quota either for their descendants who had to leave Estonia for military service.

Deputy Kaido Kama, representing the interests of the Congress of Estonian Citizens, believes that this is "the best of all the laws adopted by the Estonian Supreme Soviet." The Congress of Estonian Citizens favours Estonia's complete and unconditional independence.

Deputy Vladimir Lebedev has a different opinion. He believes the law does not guarantee the observance of human rights and contradicts the Constitutions of the Estonian Republic. He believes that the vote itself was in violation of the Consitution. A qualified two-thirds majority, and not simple majority, wasneeded to pass the bill, he said.

The parliamentary majority believes that Lebedev's reference to the Constitution is groundless. They say that the Constitution has not operated from the moment the period of transition was announced in March and Soviet power was proclaimed illegal.

Before the vote the Russian-speaking deputies pointed out that the bill did not state clearly who are regarded as Estonian citizens.

Even deputies from the Congress of Estonian Citizens now admit that many contradictions regarding the law on immigration could have been avoided and that there is a need for a law on citizenship. The bill has been prepared and published in Estonian. However, the bill does not mention Estonia's Russian-speaking population.

Possible Estonian Rights Group Theft Probed

LD1606155490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0843 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn, 16 June, (TASS)—There is disquiet in the camp of Estonian "rights defenders" and their fellow thinkers abroad, as the affair of the missing R100,000 has surfaced again.

About two years ago a report appeared in EESTI PAEVALEHT, a newspaper published by Estonian emigres, about the fact that the so-called Center for Aiding Imprisoned Fighters for Estonia's Freedom had collected R100,000 and sent it to their fellow thinkers in Estonia. If one considers the fact that at that time only four "rights defenders" were serving terms of punishment, it is easy to imagine the size of the sum due to each of them.

Erna Tarto, the wife of Enn Tarto who had been convicted of anti-Soviet agitation, decided to obtain the share due to her and her family. Oral requests, by telephone, and written requests to Tiit Madisson, chief of the aid center, who lives in Sweden, brought no results. And, the answer "why did you decide that this money is intended for you?" was completely perplexing. However, Erna Tarto decided not to retreat from her planned course and sought out in Estonia a certain Matti Kiirend, who was engaged in the distribution of the assistance arriving from abroad. According to one version, Kiirend was handing over money to her through figureheads. According to another, he was not handing anything over at all, since he was afraid that the recipient would betray the messenger to the KGB. Erno Tarto did not succeed, therefore, in clarifying the matter.

Nor would journalists, who were also interested in the missing R100,000, manage to clarify the affair. When Inga Raitar, who was gathering material for an article on the wives of Estonian "rights defenders," asked Kiirend in Estonia about the money and Madisson about it by telephone in Sweden, they both stated that only KGB agents could be interested in this affair.

Another journalist, Ainar Ruussaar, was also suspected of having connections with the KGB. Rumors about his serving in the KGB spread among his colleagues and acquaintances after his article—pointing out that all the unclear points in the affair of the money from abroad—mysteriously vanished from the editorial office of the independent weekly EESTI EKSPRESS. Neither the weekly, nor Ruussaar himself, as far as one may judge from published articles, have any special sympathies for the KGB.

If the KGB was really mixed up in this affair (and suppositions were expressed at one time that the money had been stolen precisely by KGB workers), why is there such nervousness in the conduct of Kirrend and Madisson? Why is everyone who begins taking an interest in the missing money suspected of being connected with the KGB? And why is there still no answer to the question of who indeed received these R 100,000 in Estonia?

Latvian Supreme Soviet Decides on Party Ties

LD2606145490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1310 GMT 26 Jun 90

[TASS correspondent Valery Zaytsev reports from the Latvian Supreme Soviet session]

[Text] Riga, 26 Jun—Starting today, the party and other sociopolitical organizations should cease their activity in the republic's law enforcement bodies, the State Comittee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, the Latvian Telegraph Agency, and a number of other state institutions.

People's deputies at a session of the republican Supreme Soviet made this decision. The Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD), the Ministry of Justice, the State Security Committee, and the courts are also subject to depoliticization. In the opinion of the Supreme Soviet, this is essential "in order to improve the operations of state institutions, organizations and enterprises, as well as ensuring the objectivity of workers in the republic's law enforcement bodies." There should now be no primary organizations here either of the Latvian Communist Party or of the People's Front—or for that matter, of other parties. In general it was these two major political forces in the republic that were under discussion. It was also decided that the leaders of all the enumerated organizations should suspend their party memberships.

The Supreme Soviet has allowed one month for the elimination of primary organizations while bodies of state administration have been instructed, in the course of two months, to abolish the structures of political leadership. This means political bodies within the system of the MVD.

It has been established that the decisions and instructions of parties and other sociopolitical organizations are not obligatory for state institutions of the republic or for all organizations and enterprises situated on Latvian territory.

Deputies of the "Equality" faction proposed an alternative document which establishes, in particular, that "membership of a party or other sociopolitical organization cannot be the reason for prohibiting labor activity in any state institutions, organizations and enterprises." However, this proposal was not adopted.

'Equality' Faction's Opposition Role Viewed

90UN2076B Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 29 May 90 p 1

[Article by Latvian SSR People's Deputy O. Shchiptsov: "There Is No Third Way"]

[Text] Article 1 of the Constitution of the Latvian republic adopted on 15 February 1922 by the Constituent Meeting states the following: "Latvia is an independent, democratic republic." Listen to the enchanting music of the words. What is wrong here? Perhaps the words "democratic republic" do not please? True, this article of the Constitution did not stop the 1934 coup...

In its sixth episode the Latvian television hit series "The Russians in Latvia" asked itself and us in heartfelt tone a question that virtually justifies the coup: "Was there really any other solution for Karlis Ulmanis?" And there on the screen we see the leader and the exultant crowds. The frames of the chronicle force us willy-nilly to recall that notable film of Romm. The "stock phrases" of the time rise to the surface in the memory: "Let our hearts belong to the leader and to the state, and let every step be a service to the country at the command of the leader, then Latvia will be strong." Something painfully familiar...

The ideological basis of the regime was contained in two sentences: "We shall love our motherland, Latvia! Let us make it beautiful, powerful, Latvian, and eternal!" Does this not remind you, dear reader, of the "new" ideology of certain political forces today? Does the true prospect not become clearer? Verily, this is the true "innovation" according to Ecclesiastes: "There is nothing of which a man can say 'behold, this is new,' for it has been before over the ages before us."

Today not everyone dares to oppose this "new" ideology after the last two years of "perestroyka" in Latvia. Some are overwhelmed by emotion, others are frozen with fear, yet others totally fail to understand the reality. And there is an urgency in the words of the Latvian historian abroad, Edgars Andersons, that at one time a regime with this kind of ideological position "diminished among the people their recognition of reality and their ability for political thinking..."

There are, therefore, many people who do not believe in democracy for an independent Latvia. The fact is that a new monopoly on thoughts, views, and convictions has already been established. The mind of any fair-minded, democratically thinking person rises up against the rapidly growing force of authoritarianism. For what he wants is real change for the better in historically multinational Latvia, real political and economic independence, life without Karabakh, without people thirsting for power, without yesterday's people greedy for social revenge.

No, it is not only the Russians that should long ago, bit by bit, have rid themselves of the slave mentality that demands a firm hand... The republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and government is in fact "mononational" and it does not reflect in any reasonable proportion the national structure of society. The "overwhelming majority" in the parliament rushes to adopt decisions that lead to political and economic impasse...

Under these conditions the "Equality" faction in the Supreme Soviet defends the interests of those who think differently. Today, the "overwhelming majority," no matter what it may wish, does not have the right to claim that it expresses the opinion of all the people of Latvia. For behind every opposition deputy stand thousands of voters. On the other hand, if the majority speaks on behalf of the people, then it should not fear a referendum. Let this be as the multinational people of Latvia wish. If they favor secession from the Union then this must be done, without violating the law. If they are against it then the issue is closed. There is no third way.

We should not, without a referendum, create a new lawlessness based on the fact that some people, say, did violate the law in the past. We cannot simply dismiss half a century just like that. In such an important matter we need prudence and substantiation.

Any sensible person who has been following the work of the parliament gets the impression that the People's Front of Latvia would like to work without opposition, without interference. This indicates that it is not ready for true democracy. They often hear the "Equality" faction but do not listen. But we should be gladdened by the presence of pluralism. True, sometimes in private conversations we hear this creep in: In fact there is no monolithic base, there is only regular party discipline, which still forces a person to do only what is required of him.

Some people believe that the presence of the "Equality" faction in the parliament is not useful, and they are calling for decisions that can be adopted only when a suitable situation has been created in society and all forms of work have been exhausted. The forum of parliament and access to the mass media offer an opportunity for direct communication with the people, some of whom are beginning to understand more clearly who has in fact assumed a conservative stance and is calling for the authoritarian past, promoting the national idea as a lure.

Those who regard the actions of the opposition as futile are deeply mistaken. This can be seen from the comments from voters of various nationalities. The "image of the enemy" is destroyed when it is not "devils with horns" but ordinary people of good will who speak from the rostrum. Of course, we have still to learn the strategy and tactics of parliamentary work and take into account the international experience of opposition work.

Under the new conditions it is impossible to discount the work experience of the workers and peasants faction in the Third and Fourth Seimas of the Latvian Republic. Then, over five years the faction of deputies acted about

900 times in the parliament, introduced 32 pieces of draft legislation, raised 99 questions, and submitted 310 proposals. Even some of the bourgeois deputies agreed with the logic of the brightest deputies in the faction, although because of class considerations they were unable to share their political positions. For example, Minister of Finance Annus recognized the profundity and logic in the understanding of the problems as demonstrated by Linards and Laytsens. Working within the parliament, the faction was able to appeal to the people.

At the same time it is also useful to learn from the mistakes of that faction. Thus, the erroneous position of the People's Front of Latvia with respect to attitudes toward the social democrats and the independents alienated Andreys Kurtsiya from the opposition. His erudition and literary gifts and authority could have been an important acquisition for the faction.

When talking about the experience of work by the opposition in European parliaments it should be emphasized that in each country consideration must be given to the specific national character and the specific political and economic situation. The opposition keeps the majority in a state of enhanced responsibility, in some cases introducing proposals and draft legislation that are popular among the people and forcing them to accept them, and in some cases combining with deputies from factions that do not represent the ruling coalition, and it strives to achieve early elections, prepares the ground for victory in the new elections, demonstrates to the people the incompetence of the government in crisis situations, monitors the activity of deputies from the majority, and uses their mistakes for a common victory in future elections.

The "Equality" faction is continuing its work associated with its own appeal to start a collection of signatures demanding that a national referendum be held. Members of the faction should be given the opportunity to appear on Latvian and Central television to set forth their positions so that people can obtain information first hand. Like any opposition, the faction must have a "shadow cabinet."

In the existing situation I think that the faction must form a delegation from its own representatives for talks with the USSR Supreme Soviet and President M. Gorbachev. Serious work lies ahead in the commissions, in the activity to implement the election platforms, and in meetings with voters and collectives.

Latvian Pro-Referendum Support Sought

90UN2076A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 29 May 90 p 1

[Statement by Latvian Republic Committee for Safeguarding the Constitution and Rights of Citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR: "Collection of Signatures Is Proceeding Apace"]

[Text] A regular meeting of the Republic Committee for Safeguarding the Constitution and Rights of Citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR, chaired by its chairman A.P. Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, has taken place in Riga.

Information on the course of the collection of signatures among the republic's population opposing the declaration "On the Restoration of the Independence of the Latvian Republic" adopted by the republic Supreme Soviet and insisting that a referendum be held before a decision is reached on the future of the state order in Latvia was presented to the committee for its consideration. It was noted that on the day that the meeting took place more than 130,000 signatures had been obtained by the committee. Information on complaints and statements being received from citizens concerning violation of their constitutional rights was also discussed.

Analysis of the correspondence makes it possible to conclude that there are strong misgivings among the public that the information provided when signatures are given, such as name, family name and patronymic, and home address, may be used by certain forces for blackmail and defamation. In this connection the committee states that the lists of signatures will be made available exclusively to the members of the committee and are for them material strictly for service use. Their purpose is to provide factual corroboration of the will of the population with respect to the declaration issued by the republic Supreme Soviet, and legal confirmation of the authenticity of the signatures. Accordingly any misgivings about providing the data that accompany signatures are groundless.

Since instances of loss of lists sent through the mail have been established, the committee requests that these materials be handed to the regional committees for safeguarding the Constitution and rights of citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR, from where they will be forwarded to the republic committee. Attitudes, both individual and collective, toward the declaration "On the Restoration of the Independence of the Latvian Republic" may be expressed personally or by messenger to the following address: Riga City, K. Valdemar Street 5, Room 309. Telephone 32-09-44. In this connection the committee hereby gives notice that the address stated previously (Riga City, Kirov Street 2) is no longer being used.

Analysis of the course of the collection of signatures shows that there are frequent cases of doubts being voiced about whether those collecting the signatures have the proper authority to do so. The committee has assigned its regional subdivisions the task of investigating each such case, and if necessary providing credentials for individuals.

Members of the republic committee have been assigned the task of hastening completion of its regional structures and bases at enterprises.

In accordance with instructions from the congress of representatives of the labor collectives and public organizations acting in defense of the Constitution and the rights of citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR, the committee elected a group of activists to deliver to the country's President M.S. Gorbachev and to the USSR Supreme Soviet a letter discussed at the congress on the political situation in the republic.

A presidium for the republic committee made up of 11 people was elected at the committee meeting.

[Signed] The Republic Committee for Safeguarding the Constitution and Rights of Citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR.

Diplomatic Historian Discusses 1940 Baltic Events

90UF0245A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 24, 16-22 Jun 90 p 8

[A. Dongarov, member of the staff of the USSR Foreign Ministry Diplomatic History Administration, answers reader's question]

[Text] *Fifty years ago the Baltic republics became a part of the USSR. How did this happen?*
[signed] V. Porshnev , Gorkiy

A. Dongarov, member of the staff of the USSR Foreign Ministry Diplomatic History Administration answers the reader's question.

On 14 June 1940, Lithuania, and on 16 June, Latvia and Estonia, were given statements by the USSR Government which in form and substance were of the nature of ultimatums. The Soviet Government maintained that the governments of these Baltic states had flagrantly violated the mutual assistance agreements concluded in September-October 1939 and were preparing an attack on Red Army units which were stationed on the territory of the three countries in accordance with these agreements. It was maintained that to coordinate their actions the Baltic governments had created an anti-Soviet "Baltic Entente" military-political alliance.

In this connection the USSR Government demanded the resignation of the governments of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia and the formation of new governments capable, as the statements said, of "providing for honest implementation" of the mutual assistance pacts and also the admittance to the territory of the three countries of additional large-scale contingents of Soviet forces. In the event of a refusal to comply with these demands, Molotov warned that the Soviet Government would adopt the appropriate measures. The Lithuanian government was given 10 hours (the night spanning 14-15 June) to reply, and the Latvian and Estonian governments, nine daytime hours of 16 June. It was declared simultaneously to the diplomatic representatives of the three countries that Soviet representatives would participate in the formation of the new governments.

Why did the USSR suddenly present these ultimatums? It need hardly be said that the three small states could not have been hatching any sinister plans. When Molotov was preparing these ultimatums, he had, as Soviet archive documents testify, no proof of the existence of such plans. Nor were such discovered subsequently, when all the archives of the Baltic governments fell into the hands of the Soviet side.

The point is that a swift outcome of the combat operations in West Europe had by the end of May become clear: France would be smashed, and Great Britain driven onto its island. Paris fell on 6 June.... And Germany did not emerge from this campaign exhausted and weakened, what is more, but even stronger economically and militarily and even more confident and, consequently, aggressive. In July 1940 Hitler ordered the Wehrmacht Command to draw up a plan for the invasion of the USSR in the fall of that same year, which, however, proved unrealistic.

Moscow could not have known of these plans for certain, although certain information was being received, all the same. But Moscow could not have failed to realize that, following the rout of France and Great Britain, Germany had lost strategic interest in preserving "friendship" with the USSR. It was at that time that it was decided to complete the "territorial-political rearrangement" of the Baltic countries, the "right" to which the Soviet Union had obtained in accordance with the secret protocols signed with Germany in August-September 1939.

And what about the Baltic governments? They knew that if they refused to satisfy the Soviet demands, the issue would be settled by means of force. At the start of June the corresponding preparations for this contingency were being made along People's Commissariat for Defense, border troops and NKVD lines. Their salvation could come only in the form of a German protest against Soviet actions in the Baltic. However, Germany did not deem it expedient to fall out with the USSR ahead of time and for this reason adhered firmly to a policy of noninterference.

Under these conditions the Baltic governments had no choice but to accept the Soviet ultimatum. The old governments resigned, and substantial Red Army forces, several times greater in numbers than these countries' national armies, were committed to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

V. Dekanozov, deputy people's commissar for foreign affairs, went to Lithuania; A. Vyshinskiy, deputy chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, to Latvia; and A. Zhdanov, secretary of the All-Russia Communist Party (Bolshevik) Central Committee, to Estonia, for the formation of the new governments and for subsequent leadership of their activity.

The crisis culminated in the creation of pro-Soviet governments which operated in the time allotted them by history on the basis of the directives of Moscow and its representatives locally.

RSFSR

Yeltsin News Conference on Congress Results

LD2606170890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Jun 90

[News conference held by Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republics Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin with domestic and foreign correspondents at the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies in Moscow—live; correspondents speak in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [video opens with shot of a platform on which Yeltsin is seated.

[Unidentified moderator] Gentlemen, we are starting the press conference. The topic of the press conference is the sovereignty of Russia, of the the Russian Federal Socialist Republic [as heard], the results of the First Congress of Russian People's Deputies, and, well, our future. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, will say—literally—a few words at the start and then we shall move on to the questions. The duration of the press conference is one hour. So, as they say, we are off.

[Yeltsin] Esteemed comrades and gentlemen: I would not like to take up time to the detriment of the number of questions which you will ask so I have only one speech. For some years now I have not met with such an audience at a press conference, and so I am glad of this meeting and think that such meetings will become traditional. So please ask your questions.

[Moderator] Please.

[(Jerzy Redlich)] (Jerzy Redlich) from Polish television. How do you see the correlation between the Communist Party of Russia and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, and in particular between yourself and Polozkov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Russia? And a second question, if I may: The Russian public evidently will not accept the market—the harsh requirements of a market economy. What measures are envisaged to avert possible concerns on this score?

[Yeltsin] Well, the first question is not an easy one for me inasmuch as I though that the Russian congress was conducted rather hastily. Those who elected them did not empower the delegates of the 28th congress to take part in the Russian congress, and to elect its leading bodies. I thought that a conference should have been held, a competent conference, and the conference would elect an organizational committee. The organizational committee would deal with the preparation of a constituent congress and would discuss in primary party organizations the program of the party, the tasks of the party, various kinds of new structural changes in the party, what will promote the renewal of the Russian party, the degree of independence of the Russian party in the CPSU, and so on. And only after this would special delgates be elected to a constituent congress of the Russian party, and, the congress would be held after the 28th congress of the party.

For this reason, turning the party conference into a congress, and such a hasty occupation of the seats before a discussion in general about what kind of party it should be and without the advice of the primary party organizations is a little hasty and this, to a certain extent, will hamper future cooperation, although one has to strive for this.

With regard to the market, yes, of course, the first stage of the transition to market relations—in the Russian program it is envisaged not to drag out this process but to start it straight away, literally now. The first stage will be very complicated. And nevertheless, the 500-day program which we have and which is designed for four stages does not envisage a drop in the population's living standard. This negative part of the transition is set off by those reserves which we have now determined as being quite realistic. Well, I do not enumerate them; there is a whole list of such real inflows as will somehow set off this negative aspect of the transition period.

[Moderator] Thank you. Colleagues, I would ask you. Please ask your question at the microphone. This is a requirement of our television so that the press conference has high-quality screening: Only via the microphones, the first and second microphone. Please, go ahead. Please, go ahead.

[Kroshin] Thank you.

[Moderator] Second microphone.

[Kroshin] Second microphone, thank you. Grigoriy Kroshin, KROKODIL magazine. We have been receiving many letters, naturally worried ones, from readers, that price increases are on the way, etc. In connection with this comes the following question: As is known, the USSR Supreme Soviet session has resolved, has instructed the Union government—prior to making any decisions—to coordinate them with the parliaments of the Union republics. Is this coordination work with the Russian parliament now being conducted? If not, what is your position on this matter. This is question number one.

And a small second question—well, it is not a very small one. Polozkov, in his first press conference literally said the following: In the complicated period when the new economic mechanism has not yet started operating, and economic relations have not taken shape, it is important to actively involve the Communist Party as a strong structure for resolving the tasks facing the republic. I request that you, Boris Nikolayevich, comment on this stand. Is this not a call for a return to the previous party administrative methods of running the economy? Thank you.

[Moderator] The first question is about coordination.

[Yeltsin] Yes, there was a decision by the congress—it is true, not a resolution on the decision of the congress in connection with the question of rising prices—to instruct the Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Council of Ministers to examine this question and, accordingly, afterward, to submit it for discussion by the Supreme Soviet in order to make a final decision. Such preparation on the matter is now under way and will be examined at the first session.

Second, Comrade Polozkov's statement. Well, there were several, including one to the effect that he is now changing his positions. Well, I would like to see in what direction he will change these positions.

[Moderator] Go ahead, second microphone.

[(Kaluzhnik)] (Kaluzhnik), SOBESEDNIK. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, the Supreme Soviet is to approve the Council of Ministers. How would you like to see it: a cabinet of experts and specialists, or a cabinet formed taking into account the multiparty system that is coming into being, with the appearance of the Social Democratic Party, the Democratic Party of Russia, etc?

[Yeltsin] Here are some of the principles that have been laid down as the basis for forming the cabinet of the Council of Ministers. The first is to reduce by half the number of ministries. This is the first principle. The second principle stipulates full rotation of the leaders of ministries and, accordingly, of deputy chairmen of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The third principle stipulates that the mayors of Moscow and Leningrad must be among the leadership, in other words, in the Council of Ministers. The fourth principle stipulates that nonparty members must, by all means, be in the composition [of the Council of Ministers] and not just one person, as is the case in the Union government, but there must be several of them. The leadership must include not only communists, but representatives of other parties, too. This is stipulated by these fundamental approaches. And yet another principle stipulates that absolutely all leaders, in other words, those making up the Council of Ministers, be younger than the chairman of the Council of Ministers and the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

[Moderator] Second microphone, please.

[Smirnov] Yevgeniy Smirnov from NOVOSTI. Tell us, please, Boris Nikolayevich, whether or not inequality of political parties can be tolerated in a law-governed state, and if not, how is the Russian parliament going to do away with the unfairness that is in evidence in this respect?

[Yeltsin] The Russian parliament has already done away with such unfairness through legislative means. At the First Congress of People's Deputies, a new wording of Article 6 was adopted which, unlike the Union version, does not mention the CPSU, if you remember. It starts in the following way: All political parties, public-political and public organizations, have an equal right to participate in society's public life; Russia is implied in this instance. And the next task is to put this legislation into practice. This is a more complex process but one should develop such a mechanism for executing laws which does not yet exist at the Union level. We at the Russian level have decided to develop such a mechanism, and to adopt without fail a law on the mechanism of implementing the execution of laws.

[Unidentified correspondent seated in auditorium] I must protest against this system. It is impossible simultaneously to write and to stand in a line to ask a question. The London newspaper THE INDEPENDENT would very much like to ask you a question.

[Yeltsin] Ask it, please.

[Correspondent] The Estonian Communist Party yesterday received a call from Vadim Medvedev, and there are now rumors to the effect that the congress will be postponed until September. Is this true or not, and if it is true, why?

[Yeltsin] It is true there are rumors. [laughter] But that the congress will be postponed, this matter has not yet been decided. The party Central Committee plenum would have to assemble and change the dates of the congress. No, this matter has not yet been decided.

[Unidentified correspondent] A colleague who is taking part in the discussion asked about the Council of Ministers before me, so I have a second question. The point is that, unfortunately, the prestige of the Union government and of the presidium is declining among the people, but you have, so to say, a very good reputation among the people. And you have until 1 March to demonstrate your good work, that you are the man the people have been waiting for. So, I would like to ask: Is the Russian Supreme Soviet today elaborating a specific program for several months ahead and for the long term for the efficient work of industry, agriculture, and other sections of the republic's national economy, also raising the responsible—measures for leaders for the efficiency they show in their work, because if today...

[Moderator, interrupting] Please be more brief.

[Correspondent] That is all. Is such a program being drawn up or not?

[Yeltsin] Yes. [laughter and applause]

[Kostantinov] Vladimir Kostantinov, of TRUD. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, now, just as happened a year ago, a complicated situation is arising in the Kuzbass and in the other coal-mining regions of the country, and at the Congress of People's Deputies a special appeal from the miners to the deputies was read out. Are you thinking of responding to this appeal in some way or, in what way precisely, to facilitate the settlement of a possible bitter conflict?

[Yeltsin] I had a meeting with a group of about 50 Kuzbass miners and a separate meeting with about the same number of Vorkuta miners, and also with a group of participants in the Donetsk congress. At these three meetings there was a discussion of one and the same thing: The miners' demands which are not being fulfilled and, however strange it may seem, not a single point has been implemented from the decision of the USSR Council of Ministers. I am not constantly in Comrade Ryzhkov's reception room and unfortunately no progress is being made. Therefore, we are now simply trying to speed things up. Taking account of our declared and adopted separation of functions between the center of the Union and the republic, the coal industry will be in the Russian Federation. Correspondingly, these associations will be set up. They themselves will be in control of the chief property, that is the things they produce. That is the first thing. And the second thing is that the Russian Federation will then take upon itself the functions of fulfilling this decision. And third, the coal workers are then giving the new leadership, the new parliament and the new government of Russia a period of grace.

[Moderator] Here is a question from the Italian newspaper AVANTI!, Boris Nikolayevich. I will read it out: What is your view of the results of the founding congress of the Russian Communist Party, and what influence can the decisions of the congress, and in particular the creation of the RSFSR Communist Party have on the 28th CPSU Congress?

[Unidentified man] What are your relations with Polozkov like, Boris Nikolayevich? [laughter]

[Yeltsin] We have not had any relations yet. Evidently, relations are going to have to emerge. We, naturally, used to say hello to each other and we knew each other. But since, when we were competing as candidates for the post of chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, I was standing for the left and he was standing for the right, you will realize for yourselves that our positions cannot exactly be convergent. I have no intention of tilting rightward. [applause] The Russian congress will, of course, exert a very considerable influence on the 28th congress, and this is alarming. And perhaps a postponement is in fact appropriate because of this.

[Moderator] Next, please.

[Leontiyeva] Boris Nikolayevich, your tactics...

[Moderator—interrupting] Could you introduce yourself?

[Leontiyeva] Leontiyeva, from the PEOPLE'S DEPUTY magazine. Your tactics during the discussion of the decree on power perhaps aroused suspicion among many of your supporters, and very much encouraged the right wing of Russian deputies. Are you certain that you were quite right then, or could pressure from the center in fact be felt?

[Yeltsin] I am sure I was right, because you must grasp the situation realistically. There is no firm democratic majority at the congress. Thirty to 35 percent are Democrats; 30 percent are Russian communists; and 30 percent are people who have not declared their position, and they change their stance depending on the issue and the circumstances. It is very complicated. So the mere fact that we wrested even this decision—just this decision on the separation of party and local soviet functions—means a great deal. And second, we did not reject the decree on power. We adopted it as a basis, and we shall do more work on it in the future to ensure that it is a genuinely solid document, equal in significance at last to the declaration on the state sovereignty of the RSFSR, and I am confident that we shall adopt it at the next RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. And Democrats need have no worries on this score, because this may perhaps in some measure have been a forced measure, but otherwise we would not have adopted anything at all.

[Unidentified correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, a question from the magazine [name indistinct], Bulgaria. How do you see the Soviet Union in the near future and what role does a sovereign Russian Federation have to play in the union of republics?

[Yeltsin] I believe in a Russian Federation which is orientated, or whose leadership at least, is orientated toward more radical and decisive steps, and not toward the half-measures which have led to a situation in which the people's lives are not better but worse. In this situation, I believe that the economic changes in Russia and especially the treaties between Russia and each of the individual republics will operate on behalf of the consolidation of the union, because everything will be based upon the economy. If the economy improves, we, as the Russian Federation, will propose our model of reform which can function throughout the union. If this Russian model for reform is accepted by all the union republics —we have treaties—then this will all accordingly be drawn out into a kind of horizontal complex without a vertical structure, without a State Planning Committee, etc., etc.

[Moderator] The second microphone, please.

[Unidentified correspondent] The Egyptian magazine ROSE AL-YUSUF. It is said that the 28th congress will be closed to correspondents. What is the reason for this decision, if it is indeed so? That is the first thing. Second, in your last press conference you were asked a question about condemning Israel's crimes against the Palestinian people. You replied that you would discuss this matter in your parliament. Was this matter discussed? If not, then when is it intended to do so?

[Yeltsin] With regard to coverage of the 28th congress, I do not know about such decisions that the mass information media, including the foreign media, will not be admitted there. I do not know about this decision. With regard to the Palestinian issue, it will be discussed in the International Affairs Committee of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

[Moderator] The first microphone, please.

[(Treslyabin)] (Treslyabin), Central Television, the "Community" program. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, I have two questions for you. The first question: Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov, in the opinion of many people, represents the conservative section of our society. In the opinion of another section, you represent the democratic section of society. In your view, how do you think that you will be able to cooperate and work together in this case? And my second question for you: Don't you think that your book uses a confession on this topic to drive a wedge between you and Gorbachev, as it were? And do not you think that this somehow does not serve consolidation in our society?

[Yeltsin] As far as the book is concerned, I do not think so, if it is not used for purposes of speculation. But if they are going to take individual chapters from the book connected only with Comrade Gorbachev, and, let us suppose, some newspapers publish it, then this will indeed be a provocation to a certain extent, since, as I promised to the Congress of People's Deputies, I have made a step to meet Gorbachev and have extended my hand to him. He has made his step in reply, and also extended his hand, and we shook hands with each other. I think that this is the first act, so to speak, and in future our cooperation should continue and become stronger. [indistinct voice in background reminding Yeltsin of other part of question] I understand. But you are repeating my relationship with Polozkov. For me this turned out to be a somewhat unexpected decision, all the same, since we were discussing another candidacy. And I was not at the congress, and so I only found out after the event, when Polozkov was being elected, when the tellers' commission completed its work. This is presently a very difficult moment, in order, on the one hand, not to antagonize the Communist Party, but on the other hand, to try to act in such a way that Polozkov turns to the left a little. [laughter]

[Unidentified correspondent] NEW YORK TRIBUNE newspaper. Sixty percent of the CPSU belong to the RCP. Many of them occupy key posts. In submitting to party discipline, will they not torpedo (?untraditional) decisions of the Russian parliament? What will the parliament do about this?

[Yeltsin] This already happened at the first congress of Russia's people's deputies. Many of the most principled decisions—if you take the declarations on state sovereigaty, on delineation of functions between the union and the republic, on people's control, on the agrarian issue, and others—were being torpedoed by the deputies' group, for instance, of the communists of Russia. But nevertheless, we found, I think, quite a good alliance, a coalition. We created such a conciliation commission from representatives of absolutely all the parties, organizations, and deputies' groups, numbering 200 deputies. It was here that we determined some solution which would be to the liking of everybody, and I think we should go further along this path, because, unlike the union congress, where even the interregional deputies' group has as yet not registered, at the first congress, right from the first, we registered 30 deputies' groups—political, territorial, profession-based, anything, as long as there are more than 50 members.

[Tyurin] The journal VOPROSY ISTORII, KPSS, Tyurin, Yuriy Vasiliyevich. Profoundly esteemed Boris Nikolayevich: The very idea of a sharp reduction in ministries and departments is favored and supported by Soviet people. Could you not give the approximate total of these many millions and where these funds will go? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] In general, I have been asked many times if there is this decentralization at union level, and we delegate to the union only six ministries in all, and all the rest are under the jurisdiction of Russia, then will not a Russian bureaucracy be created? And for this reason, I answer: Under no circumstances. All the democratization and decentralization will apply to the Russian level, too. That is, the most important, powerful soviet should be the rayon soviet, the one which is closest to people. The rayon soviet gives some power to the oblast, and the oblast gives some power to Russia, and Russia, accordingly, to the union. So that such a kind of inverted pyramid, as it were, provides a basis. Our most important soviet is the rayon soviet and it has to be strengthened. That's the most important thing, and that is our task in fact, and at this level, the Russian bureaucracy should be as small as possible.

Today the halving of the number of ministries is only the first stage, and those ministries which cease to exist will be independent associations, associations which will function within the framework of market relations.

[Unidentified speaker] That is, this is the slogan, Boris Nikolayevich, which we have had for a long time, from the first months of Soviet power: Power to the soviets and not to the party? Is that right.

[Yeltsin] Without a doubt.

[Moderator] The second microphone, please.

[Makartsev] Yuriy Makartsev, observer of the journal RODINA. Boris Nikolayevich, I would like to ask you about the fourth estate of the republic—about the press. When the question of the mass media was discussed at the congress it seemed to me that the main emphasis was placed on creating the structures of republican radio broadcasting and television. Tell me, newspapers, journals, and periodicals—what kind of plans and forms are there here? And, on the way, Boris Nikolayevich, I would like to draw your attention to the impoverished situation of the journal RODINA. I imagine that you are aware of this problem, and so again, the editorial office wrote a petition addressed to the secretariat of the congress, and, as always there has been no response. And when will structures emerge in the Supreme Soviet to which journalists and editorial offices might turn directly? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] Well, the congress, perhaps really did arouse among journalists a certain dissatisfaction with the course of the discussions, inasmuch as this came up at the end of the congress and the times—an hour for discussion—was perhaps not much. But the decision was basically that the Russian Federation or the Russian state should have its own mass media—television, including alternative television, radio, press, newspapers, telegraph agencies. Well, in the press—one had in mind not only newspapers and journals among them.

And then, on the basis of this resolution of the Congress of People's Deputies, the law will be drafted, as well as specific measures to put the decision into effect. And then this decision will, as it were, be going from above downward, that is, it is intended, that is, in the resolution that includes this, to embrace the rayon, city, oblast level, and so on, since at the moment, in many territories, the newspapers have ceased to be joint party and soviet organs, but have become purely party ones: even the Moscow PRAVDA, you know.

And so we need to back up the soviets, taking into account that there is, in particular, newsprint in the RSFSR, and we are now thinking of probably [keeping] it here, the paper, and then it will be easier to tackle the question of creating newspapers which are indeed of the soviet of people's deputies at all levels. We know that RODINA is our magazine, ours, a Russian magazine, and so... I have not received your petition, but probably we will have to deal specifically with your problems.

[Correspondent] [Name indistinct] AL WATAN, Kuwait. Boris Nikolayevich, we have known you [word indistinct] (?in opposition). What will Boris Yeltsin be like in power, first, as regards privileges, and second, with respect to the opposition?

[Yeltsin] Of course, this role is somewhat different. It is always easier to criticize when you are in opposition. But that does not mean that now that I am in power, I will not be criticizing Gorbachev. For example, I am very dissatisfied, and moreover I have told him this, that he let slip preparations for the Russian Congress, and also for the 28th party congress, including the nomination of candidates for delegates, and so on and so forth, and on other issues. So, yes, there will be a certain softening, without question, because now the opinions of others also have to be taken into account because there is such a variety and variation in opinions at the People's Deputies Congress, because we have recognized 30 deputies' groups and we have to hear out each group's opinions.

This is not any grey monolith, headed by the CPSU as a cementing organization, but a variety of colors, and this variegation of these opinions, this great difference of views' and opinions must without fail be taken into account. And so, my attitude to the opposition is that of seeing it as a reality that must be reckoned with, and ways must be sought in order to cooperate with it.

[Unidentifed journalist] Boris Nikolayevich, well, a question from VECHERNAYA MOSKVA. In your opinion, will the People's Deputies Congress in time, in time—I mean the Russian one—move to the left, or will it go to the right, in the tracks of the Congress of Communists of Russia?

[Yeltsin] In no way will it go after the Congress of Communists of Russia, since it waited the whole time, right up until Friday, to ensure that there was no kind of attack addressed toward Soviet power. Well, nevertheless, that did not happen, and therefore the congress ended its work on Friday. [laughter]

[Moderator] Thank you, go ahead please.

[Yeltsin] I think that it will move to the left. But how quickly, time will tell. But intuitively, I feel that it will move to the left because, nevertheless, at the end of the congress, I will say that I felt more support than at the beginning.

[Moderator] Microphone one, please.

[Politi] Marco Politi, II MESSAGGERO. Two questions, please. You said that the CPSU Central Committee will decide the date of the congress. But when will there be a Central Committee plenum? The first question.

[Yeltsin] I don't know.

[Politi] Thank you. [laughter] And the second question. A few days ago you met Austrian journalists. You told them that you advised Gorbachev not to be both president of the USSR and at the same time leader of the CPSU. Why did you give that advice? And don't you think that if he is only president of the USSR, he will be weakened because he will not have any party? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] I understand that in Austria you have the functions combined, but that is by tradition. You don't have the monopoly of the party on power. Therefore, that does not carry any danger. But in our country, when the party has the monopoly on power, the combination of functions carries a danger, carries the potential of reviving the personality cult. Therefore, I have always been against these functions being combined. I am for the separation of these functions, for the separation. And I have said this on more than one occasion to Gorbachev, and I said right away, that in no way do I lay claim to the secretariat of the Russian party Central Committee, not in any way. It is enough for me to work 20 hours out of 24 as Russian Federation Supreme Soviet chairman. I think that the party has lost out in many ways, that by holding both posts, Gorbachev has not devoted enough time to the party.

[Zhuravlev] Vasiliy Zhuravlev, of the independent Czech weekly TVORBA. Boris Nikolayevich, will the government of Russia conduct a soverign foreign policy? In particular, do you intend to discuss in parliament the question with regard to the multibillion contribution for the stay of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia over a period of 22 years.

[Yeltsin] The Russian Federation, including the parliament, will conduct an independent internal and external policy eventually. Therefore, we are organizing a special structure for that. That is, there will be a foreign economic committee. There will be the foreign trade bank of Russia which will be independent and subordinated to the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet. Further, there will be, well, there already exists a Foreign Ministry but now the Foreign Ministry will have totally different functions that is directed toward concluding treaties with other states, with other states. Many countries have already given their agreement to holding talks. We need to create these structures and correspondingly to conclude treaties between Russia and other countries.

[Unidentified correspondent] AL-ITTIHAD newspaper of the United Arab Emirates asks this question: At your news conference after your election as Russian Federation Parliament chairman, you said that the Arabs, the PLO, and Israel should agree on a settlement of the Near East problems. That statement is diametrically opposed to the USSR's stable policy on the Near East questin which envisages the convocation of an international conference with participation of all sides in the conflict and the UN Security Council's five permanent members under UN aegis. Can this statement of yours be understood to mean that you demand that it should be the aim not to get involved in the settlement of any regional conflict at all or else to stand aside from it?

[Yeltsin] I think that all the same we should get away from our old ways of it being obligatory to lead someone along behind us, including foreign states. That does not mean not getting involved. One should participate, so to say, in justice, in resolving conflicts in some places. But as far as concerns leading states along behind us, we have already had the experience of the eastern countries, or the countries of Eastern Europe. We led them on a short rein. They finally cut that short rein and went their own way, quite rapidly and energetically, making their society more democratic and, correspondingly, things in their countries now—not in all but at least in a number of countries—are going better than in our country. Of course, if our country is invited, including Russia, to take part in this conference, undoubtedly we will not refuse, we will participate.

[Unidentified correspondent] A question from the magazine RABOTNITSA. Boris Nikolayevich, fresh and energetic forces are gathering around you. Why aren't there any outstanding women political leaders around you?

[Yeltsin] I do not quite agree since a number of women deputies came to the fore at the People's Deputies Congress. It's just that they were not really so noticeable, but I, for example, can see women, political figures, professionals, who are quite outstanding both in the congresses of the Union People's Deputies and that of Russia. Now we simply need to involve them in work at the Supreme Soviet and in the office of the Russian Council of Ministers.

[Moderator] Your question, please.

[Yeltsin] Introduce yourself.

[Correspondent] [Name indistinct], a freelance journalist. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, do you consider the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet's 11 March decision to be lawful when the deputies voted in favor of it by 126 to 6? Second, the Soviet Government always uses the concept of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] in its addresses. If a blockade has been declared against the Lithuanian SSR citizens—that is the Soviet Government has declared an economic blockade against its own people—is this constitutional? And, finally, you have met Landsbergis. In brief, what were that meeting's results, in your view, and what are the prospects for mutual relations between sovereign Russia and independent Lithuania?

[Yeltsin] From the very outset of this conflict I have been in favor of suspending the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's 11 March decision for the duration of talks and of suspending the presidential decree for the duration of talks on the blockade. I am against the blockade, especially a blockade against one's own people. Whatever events have unfolded in Poland, Czechoslovakia, the GDR, etc. over the recent period, supplies of neither oil nor gas were stopped to them. And why is it that when Lithuania has suddenly decided to declare its independence that pressure is immediately displayed, as it were? But we should have learned already, most likely, that force is replied to with even greater resistance and this matter will never be resolved with force. The matter can only be resolved through talks. For this reason, even at that point, I wrote both to Gorbachev and Landsbergis: I earnestly ask you to suspend that decison and this decree and to sit down for a period of time, sit down at the conference table. I believe that today they have sat down at the conference table.

As for relations with Lithuania and my meeting with Landsbergis: Yes, we did meet. We agreed to conclude a treaty between Russia and Lithuania, and that Russia would set no preliminary conditions, either political or economic. A comprehensive treaty—economic, commercial, political, social, national, cultural etc etc. And groups have now already begun to work out this treaty. There is an accord to conclude such treaties with Estonia, Latvia, Moldavia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Kazakhstan. We have now also addressed other republics.

[Moderator] The first microphone, please.

[Polzikov] Stanislav Polzikov, NOVOSTI. Boris Nikolayevich, what is the attitude of Yeltsin the communist to the 28th congress and what is the attitude of Yeltsin the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman to the 28th congress? Is there a contradiction between them?

[Yeltsin] My position has not changed since I was in opposition. Nevertheless my position is this: I think the 28th party congress is the last chance, the last chance for the renewal, the radical renewal of the party. If such a renewal takes place at the congress, and not a stereotype one, connected with just plastering and painting the facade, but a really radical perestroyka and reconstruction of the party which would arouse respect among the people, or if this respect were to become a reality today, then I favor such an approach and I will remain a party member.

However, if such a renewal does not take place, if there is another attempt to draw everyone up in a single column and move toward the bright future, then, well, Yeltsin, as Supreme Soviet chairman, will either end his CPSU membership or perhaps will go in for other steps. The 28th party congress will show.

[Moderator] The second microphone, please.

[Pleipkin] FRG Television, (Fritz Pleipkin). You said this was the last chance. Do you expect a split in the CPSU, and will there be a new party, a party of restructuring, and will you enter into an alliance with Gorbachev in order to stabilize the situation in the USSR?

[Yeltsin] Gorbachev was a little late with this union, although I am willing, and I have already said it today, to cooperate for the sake of perestroyka and for the sake of our society's renewal. I repeat once again: If the party's renewal really does take place, if it does not take up the positions which, after all, the Russian Congress has taken up, then, yes, I am willing, and then there will not be a split, then those platforms which do exist must exist within the CPSU. This is not something to be afraid of. In some countries they sometimes even maintain an opposition especially in order for it to create a certain dynamism in society. It is the same thing in the CPSU. If there are not any different currents there, then the CPSU stagnates. But if there are different platforms, one, two, perhaps three platforms, with discussions, arguments, and so on, then this will create a certain dynamism, so to speak, a certain movement within the CPSU. Therefore, I am opposed to the principle of democratic centralism. I am in favor of there being, if not factions within the CPSU, then at least platforms. If renewal does not take place at the 28th congress, then a split in the CPSU and the creation of new parties are possible.

[Moderator] Please go ahead.

[Foldvari] Hungarian Television, Geza Foldvari. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, it is clear that a process of disintegration of the Soviet Union is taking place. Is a soveriegn Russia able to put a break on this split or to speed it up? And another small question. Are the rumors true that you have your own bodyguards, your own protection service—meaning that you do not trust the KGB?

[Yeltsin] I think that—take the agreements with union republics, the multilateral ones, the economic ones, and so on. They will nevertheless promote the consolidation and the strengthening of the union and not its break-up. We are not in favor of Russia's self-isolation. We are in favor of Russia ultimately having its own statehood, of it not being just an appendage of the center, with all the shortcomings and failures of the center, of necessity, therefore, being mechanically transferred, so that these are not the failures of Russia and of the people of Russia. Therefore, we say yes to sovereignty, yes to the maximum degree of independence, yes, we take upon ourselves the greater share, the greater burden. We take the burden from the center, we take the burden from the union government. We go for this deliberately, because we want to act with our own hands in such a way that the people of Russia have a better life. But in no way must this serve, must this urge things toward the union's disintegration. On the contrary, we must be the consolidating nucleus, so that by concluding treaties we might perhaps hold back to the maximum degree those republics which have not yet finally made up their minds to secede from our union.

As for the protection, the Supreme Soviet—actually, no, the congress, the People's Deputies Congress has decided to create a subunit, a small subunit. We do not need 1,000 people. I mean, if we take into account that the work has to be carried out 24 hours a day. If we consider Moscow as well it will be 10 people perhaps. But it will be a subunit, a special protection subunit not subordinated to the KGB.

As a matter of fact, in many civilized states the president or chairman is never protected by a service of the executive branch. This service is, as a rule, attached to the president, not to the executive body. And the KGB is the body of the Council of Ministers, which means that it is the body of the executive power.

[Moderator] First microphone, please.

[(Uglanov)] (Andrey Uglanov), ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. Boris Nikolayevich, tell us please, have concrete negotiations with any of the union republics concerning the foundations of a new union treaty started yet? Second question: When will the obligatory renunciation of combining duties—as was proclaimed by the decision of the congress on the mechanism of people's power—begin? And the last question: Will the level of Russia's investments in the union budget, including the hard currency ones, be revised by the next financial year?

[Yeltsin] The first question: Negotiations have started. We met the leadership, as I have already said, of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Moldavia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belorussia. We have agreed on the principles of approaching the conclusion of this treaty, on the setting up of special working groups, on the structure of the treaty, on the approximate deadline for the conclusion of such treaties, so that we will not miss 1991. So all this already has a real basis.

The second question regarding the combining of functions: This is a decision which takes immediate effect. And as for the new elections, we should not let them take place at all. As for the areas where functions are currently combined, this should be abolished, literally, in a matter of months. This process must be carried out in accordance with the decision of the Congress of People's Deputies.

And with regard to the division of the budget and our deductions, this year we will separate the Russian bank from the union one, and we will be able to halt this pumping of funds from Russia, including foreign currency funds, and we will set up a foreign trading bank. But, in reality, this is, of course, already a clear division of the 1991 budget where we will allocate a certain sum for each article of the budget and for each union program according to a calculation, and not just pump 70 billion rubles outside Russia.

[Moderator] On the left, please.

[Unidentified correspondent] Danish radio: You said that the delegates at the congress of the Russian Communist Party did not have the authority to establish that party. Do you consider the decisions of the congress to be lawful and competent?

[Yeltsin] I believe, anyway, that the congress should not have tackled this matter without having this authority and without having discussed beforehand the party's aims and tasks in the primary party organizations. I believe that the majority of primary party ortganizations will, for all that, condemn these decisions by the congress.

[Moderator] Please.

[Unidentified correspondent] INTERFAX. Boris Nikolayevich, issues regarding the country's defense belong to the union, but will issues regarding the transfer of troops and economic activity on the republic's territory be coordinated with the republic's government or with you as chairman of the Supreme Soviet?

[Yeltsin] We now have the new structure of the office of the Council of Ministers which envisages ministers for those ministries which have been transfered to the competence of the union, say, the Defense Ministry. We will also have a minister for links with the Defense Ministry, a Russian defense minister, as it were, but without a ministry. He will have a group of advisers and he will be in contact with the union Defense Ministry on all matters relating to the actions of the union Defense Ministry on the territory of the RSFSR—the construction of bases or the relocation of subunits, units, etc. All of this should be precisely coordinated and agreed with this department.

[Moderator] Please.

[(Zavodkina)] The microphone is too far away.

[Moderator] What?

[(Zavodkina)] The microphone is too far away. I'm sorry. Tell me please...

[Moderator—interrupting] Introduce yourself, please.

[(Zavodkina)] The paper KARYERA. (Galina Georgiyevna Zavodkina). Boris Nikolayevich, tell me please, are you able to determine now how you will react to the five-minute action by cultural workers?

[Yeltsin] Well, we must react in such a way that in the end we really become involved in culture in a specific manner. This brings us, again and again, to this problem, the problem of spirituality, the problem of culture, since the revival of Russia without the revival of culture, and perhaps primarily, all the rest of the revival is impossible.

[Moderator] The second microphone please.

[Unidentified correspondent] I am from the U.S. political magazine NEW REPUBLIC. My questions refers to a pronouncement you made in the television interview yesterday. You said that resources had been pumped out of Russia for 73 years and that you would like to return. Could you please be more specific about who has been pumping out the resources, what you would like to return to, and to what extent the things you are doing are absolutely new and not, in fact, a return.

[Yeltsin] It is a question of elementary justice and a return to the fact that Russia is obtaining statehood. Therefore, Russia should be treated as a state, a sovereign state within the union's composition. And to simply command from the top to pay 70 billion rubles a year to somewhere beyond Russia's borders is already a form of diktat and coercion. Therefore, I repeat, this will be revised and such payments will be strictly in accordance with calculations. If we do not need some union program and we are not interested in it, be it space or any other union program, we will not pay toward it. And we do not want to participate in paying the bill for that huge bureaucratic apparatus which today, after five years of calls for dismantling the administrative-command system, is still in existence. And we are dismantling it by, for example, giving up 60 union ministries—we do not need their services—and not by creating additional ministries, this time Russian ones, but through independent enterprises joined in some voluntary associations and so on. This is what we are returning to, we are returning to justice.

[Unidentified correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, the VOZDUSHNYY TRANSPORT newspaper asks a fairly long-winded question but the gist is as follows. You said in your interview that a number of ministries, including the Civil Aviation Ministry, remains under the USSR Government's control. Then comrades here write about a most difficult situation in civil aviation and ask whether the Russian government will remain deaf to our aviators' needs. They are very worried about the prospect of remaining under the old administration.

[Yeltsin] Yes, a group of people's deputies from civil aviation have asked me to meet civil aviation staff and they have asked to be placed under Russian command, to be taken into Russia. [laughter] I do not find this problem funny. Each country has several firms, why cannot there be a Russian Aeroflot or that of any other republic? Then Russia would take care of this Aeroflot. At the first stage we are yet not ready for that. We have not discussed the issue but, I think, we will discuss it with Aeroflot and this looks quite feasible for the second stage, since there are the Sheremetyevo, the Vnukovo, and many other airports on our territory. Indeed, we could pay greater attention to Aeroflot's needs here.

[Moderator] Boris Nikolayevich, Mayak asks a very interesting question: What was the hardest thing for you in the last three years, from your overthrow to your take-off?

[Yeltsin] The hardest part was the time when I was as if, not exactly out of action, but, in general, out of favor, and when I could not get a single minute of television airtime or a single line in a newspaper and my name did not figure anywhere for a year and a half, only breaking through after a year and a half in Jurmala, thanks to (Aleksandr Kolbik), a journalist. And after that this breakthrough began. That was, maybe, the very, very hardest time. Subsequently, with the struggle already in progress, this is an interesting time, although hard and difficult. The congress was also hard, very hard, and that month when the congress—such a long hose-like hell which is unsuitable, of course, for holding a congress, when you can't see people's faces because they are sitting up to 100 meters away—that was very inconvenient—and, nevertheless, when you feel that the congress is passing by, and yet you find some kind of solution [as heard]. All the same, we managed to conclude the congress and conclude it well, with a most powerful document on the division of these functions. I feel that, all the same, perhaps the hard part is behind me, but there are still quite a few difficulties ahead.

[Moderator] Go ahead, please.

[Unidentified correspondent] The British newspaper THE GUARDIAN. You said that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev should not continue his duties as Communist Party general secretary. My question is: Who is your candidate for this post?

[Yeltsin] The 28th congress will show. I, of course, don't think that it will be Ligachev. [laughter]

[(Leptov)] The newspaper EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN, (Leptov). I was one of the first to place a note on your table. Please answer those questions.

[Moderator] Wait, wait. Microphone two, please.

[Unidentified correspondent] Another question with regard to the congress, Boris Nikolayevich. What is your personal view? Do you think that the congress should now take place on 2 July or a little later? And, as a Central Committee member, do you think—what will be number of votes at this plenum—before the congress, will the plenum be against this congress now, or in favor?

[Yeltsin] The congress...rather, the plenum will be a very difficult one. There will be a real battle at it. Some are in favor of holding the congress now under the atmosphere of the Russian congress. Others are in favor, somehow, of, well, say, stabilizing somewhat this, political nuance, if you like, which has appeared and will be in favor of postponing the congress a little, perhaps to the fall.

[Unidentified correspondent] And your personal view?

[Yeltsin] I think that I incline toward perhaps postponing the congress and preparing it in a more solid and thorough way, and not, perhaps, as hastily as the congress, the Russian conference-congress was held, inasmuch as Gorbachev, too, is guilty of this. After all, he was chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau, and it seems to me that he was swamped by presidential affairs and he paid insufficient attention to the preparation of the conference and congress and he got the response to this.

[Moderator] We apologize to the newspaper EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN. The first ones always suffer. Here are the questions. At the RSFSR People's Deputies Congress the creation of an independent RSFSR Gosbank [state bank] was proclaimed with its own powers in the sphere of money and credit policy. Will this be in keeping with the preservation and development of an all-union market and maintaining the stability of the ruble? How? That is the first one.

[Yeltsin] That's clear. Russia will strive—and we have such a program—to stabilize the ruble and stabilize the situation, but we can not permit the Russian bank to issue [changes thought] Only union departments, the Ministry of Finance, and the union Gosbank can engage in and do engage in issues. But the Russian bank should monitor issues although this monitoring is very relative and it will be difficult to reveal how much money paper notes—will be put into circulation. This is one of the most difficult questions in the whole reform. And for this reason we propose that if we sit at the negotiating table we will put forward our Russian program for the union, and we will propose to Gorbachev and Ryzhkov that if this program is accepted, then, starting with Russia all the republics of the whole country will be drawn in and then this reform, clearly, with a single currency, will go well. But if this reform is not accepted then Russia will be forced to go for its own currency, although this, of course, will hamper absolutely all relations within the country in a colossal way, and we would not like this.

[Moderator] The second question: At the congress, the question was discussed about writing off the debts of the Russian kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] to an overall value of R70 billion. Apart from this, it is envisaged not to impose interest on them for fixed-term credits. From what sources is it intended to implement these measures?

[Yeltsin] We went for two stages of special indebtedness. The agrarian workers, of course, insisted on a complete write-off, but at present we do not have such possibilities and we calculated the possibilities which we will have by the end of the year and for this reason went for a partial write-off now. In the second stage, when the people's deputies extraordinary congress convenes to discuss the agrarian question, we will decide the second part of the question too.

[Moderator] Esteemed colleagues, our time is coming to a close. The last question from the hall, please.

[Unidentified correspondent] NOVOSTI. My question is as follows: Everybody knows how complicated our country's spiritual situation is. It applies to Russia as well. Does the Supreme Soviet have any program for Russia's spiritual revival?

[Yeltsin] Such a program exists. It is implied by the structure of the cabinet of the Council of Ministers and of the Supreme Soviet. Both the Supreme Soviet and the government have such a program. But another thing is that we have to work out a mechanism to implement these programs and laws. You can see on the republican level that laws are not implemented. This is one of the main troubles. So, we will examine and approve the whole mechanism of realization and of implementation of programs and laws. And after that, well, I think, that this process will go much faster for us. Once again, there cannot be a general revival of Russia without its spiritual revival.

[Moderator] Esteemed colleagues, the time—one more question is all right.

[Unidentified correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, DIALOG magazine of the CPSU Central Committee. We all know that the USSR Supreme Soviet has adopted some good but nonoperating laws. What kind of guarantee do we have that Russia's laws are going to work?

[Yeltsin] I have just explained this issue. Yes, a mechanism of realization of laws was not worked out at the union level. This very mechanism will be one of the first laws to be adopted by Russia's Supreme Soviet.

[Moderator] Esteemed colleagues....

[Yeltsin] Thank you very much. All the best. [applause]

Congress Issues Resolution on 'Current Moment'

PM2506104990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1,2

[Text] Following is the text of a resolution adopted today at the Congress of the RSFSR Communist Party.

RESOLUTION

On the current moment and the primary tasks of the RSFSR Communist Party:

We, delegates of the Constitutent Congress of Communists of the Russian Federation, assess the situation in the country and party as a crisis one, demanding immediate practical actions to achieve civil accord, consolidation, and renovation of society. The reasons for the crisis are: a profound deformation of socialism during the period of totalitarianism and stagnation; the objective difficulties of the transitional period; mistakes and misjudgments in the execution of reforms already under the conditions of perestroyka. The country is going through an extraordinarily important, difficult and dangerous phase. A painful break with old political and economic structures is occurring, while the creation of new ones is not keeping up with the process of their dismantling, is lagging behind the demands of life, and is not always carried out with thought. It has so far proved impossible to resolve many problems that had been building up for decades. The risk of a return to the command-bureaucratic system remains.

Contradictions in society are being exacerbated; economic, political, and social tension is increasing. The situation in the economy and the consumer market is getting worse, the positions and influence of the shadow economy are becoming stronger, and the standard of living of the majority of the population is being lowered. The foundations of morality are being eroded, discipline and law and order are being extremely weakened, and crime is growing. The split in society on ethnic, territorial, and social grounds is deepening. A real threat to the state's internal security and the integrity of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has arisen. The people is tired of instability in the country.

Many problems of the Russian Federation have also worsened: The absence of genuine sovereignty and the political and economic system existing in the RSFSR have turned Russia into a supplier of resources and have seriously complicated the situation in the republic and the situation of all peoples, especially the small peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East. A number of regions are on the verge of ecological disaster. The issue of the spiritual renaissance of Russia, the historical memory of peoples, and the preservation of the priceless relics of its culture and the inculcation of patriotism has arisen particularly acutely.

The crisis of confidence in the CPSU, the institutions of authority and the country's political leadership, is being exacerbated. Many organizations and structures of the party, aimed at being a guarantor of social stability and the renovation of society have in fact occupied a passive position, have not developed a clear-cut ideological line, and are not carrying out a dialogue with the masses and new parties, public organizations and movements, as they should. The party has lagged behind the dynamic processes of perestroyka in society, which it itself initiated. Fulfillment of the decisions of the 19th party conference on perestroyka in the CPSU has been unjustifiably drawn out. It is precisely this which is one of the reasons for the decrease in its authority. The situation is worsened by the fact that under the flag of democratization or the protection of the "true" foundations of socialism and national revival attempts to split the party from within are being undertaken.

The CPSU bears political and moral responsibility for the present state of society. The party must conduct the process of cleansing (itself) from corrupted elements, from protectionism and nepotism, the removal of privileges, to the end, and must determine the degree of personal responsibility of members of the Central Comnmittee and Politburo, the leading communists, for the mistakes made.

At the same time the congress resolutely rejects attempts to cast a shadow on those who, honestly and conscientiously, have been working and defending their Fatherland, who have been conscious of the necessity of perestroyka and have taken a resolute step on the path of renovation.

We RSFSR communists have no doubts about the correctness of the socialist choice made by the peoples of Russia in October 1917. It would be a tragic mistake to turn from the path trodden by sufferings and by the whole process of historical development of humanity.

One must not turn the just criticism of mistakes of the past into slurring the honest labor of Soviet people.

The difficult crisis in the country has been actuated not by the socialist idea but by a policy of a distorted concept of it and the alienation of the worker from ownership, the citizen from power, and the individual from culture.

The congress considers that only the energetic, selfless activity of the party in the name of the basic interests of the people is capable of ensuring its vanguard role and the firm and resolute support of working people.

The republican Communist Party will aspire to become the center of consolidation of the creative, constructive forces of its peoples. Constructive interaction with the organs of public authority, unity with the working people, close cooperation with all progressive forces and internal democratic unity are to become the basis of the activity of the communists of the Russian Federation in the cause of deepening the achievements of perestroyka and their contribution to the affirmation of civil peace and concord.

The delegates to the congress note that the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee has been working unsatisfactorily, has not become the center of coordination of the activity of the party organizations of the republic, and has not shown the necessary influence on the preparation of the Russian party conference.

The congress charges the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee with preparing for discussion and adoption by the second phase of the congress a specific political program for the resolute renewal of the public life of the republic. We consider the primary tasks in this to be:

- getting society out of crisis on the basis of the energetic and consistent execution of reforms in the political, economic, social, and spiritual spheres, the strengthening of stability, the consolidation of public tendencies and groups which are defending the basic interests of the working people;

- political support by all means possible of the conclusion on a voluntary basis of a new union treaty, which must ensure the unconditional observance of civil rights of the population on the whole territory of the country and balance the interests of the republics, including the sovereign RSFSR;

- assistance for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, local soviets of people's deputies in affirming their full authority, support of the efforts of organs of state power and administration of the republic regarding getting it out of crisis, implementing a transfer to a regulated market economy, strengthening legality and law and order, strengthening the struggle against organized crime, the shadow economy, and other anti-social manifestations. An increase in the responsibility of communist deputies before the electorate and party organizations for implementing reforms in the political, economic, and spiritual spheres. The formation of all levels of party groups in soviets and the coordination of their activity for the purposes of carrying out the political line of the CPSU;

- the development of a system of measures for the social protection of the working people, especially the poorly provided- for categories of the population. Consolidation of the role of the socialist state as the basic guarantor of social protection of Soviet people;

- The revival of man's interest in the earth, of peasant labor as a way of life, of the social reconstruction of the countryside; the formation of multiple forms of ownership with equal rights;

- improvement of the ecological situation, primarily in unfavored regions;

- the development of a law on protecting the health of the republic's population as a legislative initiative;

- the top priority development of science, education, and culture.

- material and moral encouragement by all means possible of talents;

- provision of support by all means possible for the Soviet Army and Navy in ensuring the defense capability of our motherland and strengthening the social protection of servicemen and members of their families.

- spiritual revival and development of original multi-ethnic culture, people's creativity, the preservation and restoration of historical and cultural monuments of the peoples of the Russian Federation, the provision of a particularly caring attitude toward the small peoples, to their culture, language, and national relics; the strengthening of internationalist relations, mutual aid and cultural mutual enrichment of the peoples of the Russian Federation;

- development of the Russian press, improvement of coverage of the life of ithe republic by the media of radio and television, strengthening book publishing and the material and technical base of poligraphic and communications enterprises;

- the formation of a system of effective interaction of the leading organs of the RSFSR Communist Party with the CPSU Central Committee in the interests of preserving and strengthening the unity of the CPSU, with the Communist parties of the union republics in the interests of working out a common political strategy, harmonization of interethnic relations and the republican economic links. The setting up of constructive mutual relations with the independent RSFSR trade unions, the Russian All-Union Leninist Young Communist League, and various sociopolitical movements, whose activity does not contradict the USSR Constitution and the constitution of the republic;

- a provision of aid to primary party organizations in their political and ideological activity.

We, the delegates of the congress of the RSFSR Communist Party, call on communists, and all the working people of Russia, for consoldiation, and resolute and bold actions to renew society. The cause of our party conscience is care about the present and future of the socialist fatherland.

Congress Issues Resolution on Farm Loans

PM2606151590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Jun 90 Single Edition p 1

["Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies Resolution on Writing Off USSR Bank Loan Debts of Kolkhozes and Sovkhozes, Irrespective of Their Departmental Subordination, and of Other Enterprises and Organizations of the RSFSR Agro-Industrial Complex"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] The Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies resolves:

1. To write off the outstanding USSR bank loan debts, as of 1 July 1990, of kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms], irrespective of their departmental subordination, and of other enterprises and organizations of the RSFSR agro-industrial complex.

2. From 1 July 1990 to cease charging kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other enterprises and organizations of the RSFSR agro-industrial complex interest on deferred long-term and short-term USSR bank loans.

3. That the RSFSR Council of Ministers, with the participation of the Agrarian Union of Russia, is to determine the procedure for writing off the debts in question.

4. To instruct the RSFSR Council of Ministers to prepare the question of totally writing off the debts of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and of other enterprises and organizations of the USSR agro-industrial complex for examination at an extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

Gorbachev Replies to Delegates' Questions

PM2606112790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report dated 23 June 1990: "Energy of the Renewed Party to Serve the Cause of the Renewal of Society: M.S. Gorbachev Answers Questions From Delegates to and Participants in the Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR]

[Text] Before delivering a speech to you, I should like first to consult you. I have a whole file here and some questions in addition. But my feeling is that you probably do not want questions now, do you? Or shall we begin with the questions?

Voices: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. Then I shall begin with them. There were very many questions—I am going to combine them all, there are 10-15 questions calling for the general secretary and the chairman of the Russian Bureau (which no longer exists) to evaluate this bureau's work.

I think that the main assessment of this bureau and the consequences of its work is that ultimately, together with the CPSU Central Committee and Russia's party organizations, we have embarked on the creation of the Communist Party of Russia.

After creating the bureau at the end of last year, we began forming its structures and two secretaries were specially brought into the CPSU Central Committee to run Russia's party organizations, the organizational sphere and the ideological and economic spheres. We began orienting the Central Committee apparatus and turning it in a specific direction. While we were getting this underway, the discussion in Russia's party organizations turned toward the need to create a party. We, too, were drawn into this process, essentially it was already clear that all the work should be subordinated to this. Such, briefly, is the history and fate of the bureau. You noted that its work has been unsatisfactory—that is your right and your prerogative. I am not asking you to return to this question. But such is its fate.

I think that the next group of questions is connected with that: How is it, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that at first you seemed to cast doubt (comrades have even read somewhere that I spoke against the creation of a Russian Communist Party) on the creation of a Russian Communist Party and then suddenly changed quickly and abruptly in favor of its creation? You know that, even though the Communist Party has already been created, the question is so important that we should return to it. There is much food for thought here, much to reflect on, and we must bear all this in mind.

The question of a Russian Communist Party has always existed in one form or another—beginning in Lenin's day. Just like the question of Russia and its role. But I do not think that I should dwell long on the history of it right now. Briefly, it may be put in these terms: It is all connected with the special unifying role of the Russian Federation and the peoples of Russia, the role that they played in the creation of our vast multinational state. And, therefore, it was important to consider everything to ensure that, even though acting from the best of motives and seeking to respond to the concern not only of communists but also of all working people of Russia, we nevertheless did not take the path that would encourage centrifugal forces both in the party and in our Union.

Incidentally, advice that Russia should move more quickly toward this path came from very many quarters. Clearly, some people were hoping that hasty and ill-considered decisions would be made and that as a result destructive tendencies would be created and be set in motion making it possible to take advantage of the situation to realize their own separatist and other schemes.

There is a whole range of problems here: Political problems, state problems; they are interconnected. Nevertheless, when we began considering it all together and came to a new understanding of the need for a profound reformation of the USSR with a view toward the real sovereignty of the republics while preserving for the center that which the subjects of the federation delegate to the center, because that is in the interests of all the republics—then we understood the urgency of this task, life drove us toward it. Then we began to look differently at Russia and at the kind of organs and political and social institutions that had been created here. After all, many things in Russia did not work. That was connected with the functioning of the Union structures. Essentially, the economy was largely geared toward Union structures, virtually all the political institutions were geared toward the Union, particularly as regards the top Russian echelon and much, much else. We saw that once we embark on reforming the federation it also becomes necessary to rethink our views on Russia's situation and on what it should really have now. That is the first point.

Second. A real process of reforming the party has begun. It is painful and I shall say more about that later. I am simply not going to drag things out now. We saw that this problem worries everyone. Communists and Russians alike were of the opinion that the creation of a Russian Communist Party may play its consolidating role both for the party organizations of the Russian Federation and for the CPSU as a whole.

I myself see a very great deal of sense in this.

The last point. We have really entered the process of pluralism. Various sociopolitical streams are already emerging. The germ of future parties already exists; they are already developing their activity. They are writing programs, devising statutes, holding meetings and discussions. Thus, this process has really started. We are on the threshold of a real multiparty system. Then the question is: Since there are going to be other political streams and other parties in Russia, will there not be a Communist Party? Thus, events in the framework of perestroyka and the renewal of society and the processes taking place in the economy, in politics, and in the sphere of the federation have urged us to rise to meet the challenges of the times. Therefore, I believe that here no one practiced any deception—we all jointly arrived at an understanding of the need to create the Communist Party of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

I am very satisfied that here, at the Constituent Congress, we Russians, the communists of Russia, have remained true to the traditions of internationalism, to a devotion to the ideals of socialism, and to loyalty to Leninist principles in the creation and functioning of the party as the political vanguard, and stated firmly that we are part of the CPSU. And we also advocated that when resolving questions of sovereignty which have also become a topical task, our republic nevertheless is and remains an equal among equals in the union and should do its utmost to strengthen friendship among the peoples.

Comrades, this is extraordinarily important. I consider this to be a sign of the maturity of the congress which has been shown here. And I greet you as communists and, through you, all the communists of Russia for such a firm position. This is very important. (Applause).

I am now going through the questions about the "180-degree turn" which I allegedly took in my views, about the Central Committee Bureau, and so on—I combined all those questions in my answer. Comrade Volkov, in particular, asked why I did not support the idea of creating the Russian Communist Party in April but do so now. I think that I have explained that. There were many questions on that theme.

Here is a "painful" question from workers. They point out that a situation has been created whereby we, here at the congress, seem to be handing out sops to people. And they asked us not to do this, not to issue mandates but to consider them invited guests, participants with a consultative vote. To enable them, as it were, to become involved in everything that is going on at the congress but not to put them in an awkward position and not to create difficulties for the congress. But in point of fact you and I have resolved that question in the course of the congress.

"The overwhelming majority of our communists have an unequivocal opinion about combining the posts of general secretary and president. That is, Comrade Gorbachev must tackle one or the other. He must be president. I would like to know what position Comrade Gorbachev himself holds on this question. If a new general secretary is elected at the 28th congress, it would be right to put forward a few names now for discussion in the period prior to the 28th congress. I ask you to read this out at the congress. And voice your opinion." Comrade Spekhov from Perm, first secretary of Solikamsk Gorkom [city party committee], raised this question.

I have voiced my opinion on this subject on several occasions. I think that we must naturally set about separating posts. I am convinced that we should keep the situation as it is basically—perhaps in different forms. I am not, after all, talking about myself. I am talking in principle. Since, perhaps the most crucial process is now under way—the regrouping of political forces and the distribution of functions between the soviets and the party, the center and the localities, the republics and the center. A highly complex process! It is taking place in a painful fashion. I am also conscious of this from our congress, from the discussion here—what interests are being affected in this!

Everything that we have all done within the framework of the political reform to revive the power of the soviets, the way in which we conducted the election campaign, the people who have appeared on the political scene via these new elections—all this enables me to say that we are by and large on the right road. I am not however overlooking all the losses, weaknesses, and painful effects of this business at all—these things do exist. But am I not talking about that now. The soviets will obviously gain strength. We have a adopted a law to determine their functions and competence. It has been decided that local soviets will receive appropriations and will run their own budgets. They will have real material possibilities and will not just adopt resolutions. The process of the soviets' gaining strength will occur from top to bottom. Our people's power will indeed be one of the deciding factors in the renewal of society.

But something else is also real today. The fact that the party is today the most powerful political organization in society. The process of renewing and distributing functions and the regrouping of cadres and political forces in the country will be determined to a considerable extent by the nature of the party's position. Whether the process goes normally, in the spirit of perestroyka, and whether positive trends are reinforced or confrontation may arise will depend on this position in many respects.

I think that there were also elements of confrontation at this congress. At the same time there was also realization that the Congress of Russian People's Deputies is also here, working alongside us. The Russian Communist Party Congress represents the whole Russian Communist Party, all Russians. In this respect we must all also think about joint efforts, about pooling our efforts, with everyone performing their role on the basis of the distribution of functions we have produced, taking a positive part in the process which is still not complete.

You will agree that the process of separating functions between the party and the soviets is indeed not yet complete. This situation can also be projected onto the country as a whole. Is separation of posts useful now, or should we retain the combination of posts for the time being, during this transitional period? I think that this should be retained for the time being. As for the form—party chairman, party chairman and deputy, party chairman and general secretary, and so on—that is another matter.

I see that comrades are unhappy—there has been a great deal of critical comment about this—with the fact that weaknesses were manifested at a crucial stage when the party is involved in its own reform, when it cannot lag behind the perestroyka processes that have gained momentum, when it must not give scope for destructive forces to develop. The Central Committee and all party links must act vigorously. We need a stance; we need guidelines; we need actions, and we need different dynamics. All this has probably been in short supply—I must agree with you here because this is most conspicuous to you. In this connection we must carry out some kind of modernization in our echelon, at the center in order not to relax everyday leadership of the party and party activity. The congress must ponder all of this thoroughly. The report to the 28th congress should, perhaps, say something about this. Comrades have made many fair comments here.

The congress will meet and consider everything. Minds have once again become impassioned. Emotions have perhaps once again flared up today for a certain period in brief speeches, while reflections are probably still being kept in reserve for the congress. Looking at the speakers, at their ardor, seeing your reaction, I sat down and made notes. I sensed that there is also the following sentiment here: The sense of passing a quick verdict on very great matters. I would very much like to warn you Russians—you do after all represent 60 percent of the coming congress. When you come to the congress, don't make hasty judgments. Can we decide and assess everything quickly, is everything clear to us now? I would like to ask you the following question: If you intend to submit some proposal or say something, make proper use of the remaining time to grasp the phenomenon and the history of the question, the realities, the possibilities, and the prospects, make forecasts, work things out. Don't get excited. Don't rush things.

There have also been some mutterings about the Politburo, whose members have mainly joined it over the last three or four years, apart from Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and I, and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, and, certainly, Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov... They are, after all, new people on the whole, novices. New hands, so to speak. Let us recall April 1985. There's no Comrade Tikhonov, Comrade Gromyko, Grishin, Aliyev, or Solomentsev... And so on. In this period virtually the entire Politburo has been replaced. It is even unnatural, I would say. It means that some natural processes have been upset within the party.

This is the same Politburo that is mounting perestroyka. It has of course permitted miscalculations, I will also say that. But when I hear people criticizing and saying that it only remains for a speaker to be told to "go to the wall" because everything else has already been said, I have to defend them. Above all in order to ensure that there is direct exacting accounting [spros] at our congress, within the party and that the appropriate assessments are made, so that we do not return to our point of departure. Defense is also necessary for this, and is very important.

I think that the congress will find an opportunity to properly evaluate everything and draw conclusions. A major renewal of our party leadership will probably take place and new forces will come to the fore. But I assure you that there is no one within the incumbent Politburo who considers their own self-seeking position or any personal comforts, so to speak, or anything else to be of importance. No. The most important thing is for all of us to ensure that the cause adopted by this selfsame Politburo which is operating today, is continued. To ensure that this cause is safeguarded against instability, mistakes, and miscalculations, and gains a second wind. That is the most important concern for everyone currently in leadership. So let us act in a partyminded fashion. Everything that needs to be done at the congress must be done. You can count on us voting—even by roll call—if there is a vote. There will be no question of it. We must do what is necessary for the party. There is not and there should not be any doubt on this.

So, I have voiced my opinion on this question. The second part of the question concerns the nomination of candidates. I don't know. We could devote one sitting to this and nominate candidates here. But the Russians may feel awkward if we embark on this and start naming candidates.

If you feel like voicing your opinion—and I believe proposals have already begun coming in—we could set aside one sitting, nominate candidates, and say whom we have named. I have no objection to that.

Here is a question from Comrades Grigoryev and Galizov from the Tatar party organization. "The idea that there has been a decline in the party's prestige is not accurate. It is not the party's prestige but the prestige of party committees at all levels and of their leaders that has declined. How can we extricate ourselves from this situation? Perhaps by rapidly renewing the leadership of party committees, including the complete renewal of the Central Committee and the Politburo?"

There are other notes on this subject. It must be said that this is a key question. Ultimately everything does indeed depend to a considerable extent on the standard and intellectual potential of our cadres. No structure, not even the most perfect one, will achieve anything if it is made up of people who are incapable of thinking in a modern fashion today, perceiving life's impulses, uniting people, going to them, understanding realities, drawing up policy and conducting practical work on the basis of this analysis. This must all be amalgamated. And the cadres are always the main element.

Why is it in our country that, even under the old edict system, we had—and still have—splendid enterprises; that we had—and still have—splendid kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms]; and even cities? People of wide-ranging ability came along and tackled everything. They smashed the obstacles and transcended everything. That is the main thing to a considerable extent.

When I visited the metallurgical combine in Norilsk, I was surrounded by metallurgists who said: "Mikhail Sergeyevich, give us the order and we'll bash the bosses" [udarit po shtabam]. I have reminded you of this because there is a note here, a reminder for me: You are said to have said the following somewhere—apply pressure from below, apply pressure from below. People are now saying, tell us what you want us to do, what you are urging us to do. We are having a plain conversation, and so I tell you the following: I think, comrades, that we must restore the normal democratic process of renewing cadres within the party. This has begun. I think that anyone who expected everything to be settled at a stroke by replaceability alone is mistaken. Why? We must take the heat of perestroyka before we cast off the stereotypes, outmoded experience and approaches, and so on.

We had to go through these democratic elections. Whereas party members sat in the trenches during the first elections, during the latest elections they were out there fighting "hand to hand" both at rallies and everywhere. They had something to say. So we are changing. Mechanical replaceability is by no means the panacea. There are rayon and oblast party committees in some parts of our country that have already experienced the third wave of replaceability but things are not changing. There is also the following phenomenon: Someone new turned up straight away, at the beginning of perestroyka, a modern man; he perceived the new ideas and acts efficiently. People like that are working successfully today and communists are not letting them go. They send us cables when we try to bring such people to Moscow.

What is the point of these arguments? I told the metallurgists in Norilsk at that time that such an order would, of course, not be given. For it is, in point of fact, a Trotskyite slogan—to "bash the bosses." At the time of the cultural revolution they also bashed them in China—they sorted things out after 15 years. So you must not treat the intellectual potential so "simply," even if it is overloaded with stereotypes and old thinking. I must tell you that, wherever you take a person from, all the same everyone must pass through the school of perestroyka, take shape, and absorb a new style, new forms, and new thinking. Otherwise it will not make sense. We are all from those times. But those who are coming into active life only now, during these years, will be different. But you and I, we are all from there. So it would be very easy to give such an order, but it would also be extremely dangerous. The process must be renewed on the basis of democratic procedures. This must be developed. Decide in each specific case.

Things are already under way, and everywhere, as a rule, on a multiple candidate basis. It is necessary to perceive everything positive and build it up, but not to close your eyes to negative manifestations either. This, in fact, is my reply to the question about party committees. And the makeup of party committees, as well as the secretary's candidacy, must be determined by the mass of the party. And then we will be secured against big mistakes. Although we will never be entirely, 100-percent guaranteed against the latter. And no one is guaranteed against them.

I have been sent this note: "To put to the vote the question of assessing the general secretary's activity and changing the location of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee." It is proposed to move it to Sverdlovsk, and also to propose to the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers also be moved to Sverdlovsk. Comrade Korolkov from Bashkiria. (Animation in the hall).

As regards the general secretary, I believe that this subject was topical here, and you all had your say. I react to this as matters proceed. But as regards a move, well, let the newly created soviet organs and the Russian Communist Party work for a bit. They will think it over. But I do not think that the Russians must change their capital. I can say this right away.

A serious question. I believe that it is necessary to answer, albeit briefly. "The report which you delivered said almost nothing about the present position and the living standards of Russia's population. Was this a deliberate omission, or did someone smooth the report in this way? Or does it reveal ignorance of the situation in the provinces?—which I doubt. The organizational committee could not agree with such a report. In order to channel the work of the conference in a more necessary direction in accordance with the aspirations of communists and of the entire population, I submit a proposal to show the conference delegates Govorukhin's movie 'We Cannot Live Like This.' Please answer the question and realize my wish. Comrade Lavrov from Yegoryevsk." Moscow Oblast, I believe? This is at the same time both a fair and an unfair comment.

Why? As regards the whole specific range of questions to be examined at the Russian Communist Party Congress, I believe, comrades, that the second stage of the congress must be devoted to this. The Central Committee elected by us, headed by the first secretary, must now make thorough preparations and work both on the report and on the action program of the Russian Communist Party under the specific conditions of the republic—with due regard for the problems which have accumulated in various regions. And I believe that this must be a very broad debate. You will not exhaust the topic in the report alone. I believe that the person who mentioned sections is right. They must be organized at the second stage of the congress. So that people can voice their opinion to the maximum. A proper assessment must be made of everything.

At that stage—and we will all be participating in it, you know—we will have a real discussion of these problems. And we will obviously make good this shortcoming there. Because the first stage was, all the same, linked with the fact that we had to hold a debate on whether or not the party should exist, to form its organs and express our attitude toward the documents which the congress was to discuss. Although, to be fair, I still tried to say something about the primary causes of the misfortunes and about the accumulated problems of the regions, particularly in sociocultural development. In this regard all, or practically all the Russian regions are inferior to many republics and have a level lower than the average for the USSR.

Question. "Mikhail Sergeyevich, what will the CPSU be—a union of the republics' parties or a coordinating center—or will the CPSU not exist at all? Comrade Shagarov, Saratov."

I am convinced that there will be a Communist Party in our country. And I foresee a long life for this party, since it expresses the socialist idea and is linked with the interests of the working class and the working people. This topic—"The party, the working class, and the workers movement"—was raised here today. In particular, Comrade Melnikov raised it, and I understand why he raised it above all. It has already impinged on him more strongly, maybe, than all of us. But even brief conversations and my brief meeting together with Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov with workers and peasants have once again convinced me that this topic must be developed further at our 28th congress. The destiny of our party lies precisely in this. Its social base is the working class, the peasantry, the progressive intelligentsia.

Therefore I am also sure about the long life of the socialist idea, and I do not reject the communist perspective. And it is from this that the Communist Party's future stems. But the party must definitely be a new party—a party perceiving everything that happens in and around the country. A party really capable now of expressing people's urgent needs and aspirations and of remaining the generator of the ideas of perestroyka and a consolidating, uniting force. If it is not reformed but remains in the form in which it has lived and acted hitherto, it will not fulfill this role. This is why it was so important for us to bring the congress forward—in order to reach a decision, examine these questions, and give a strong boost to the party's renewal. Either it must change and head the movement of our people—above all, the working class—or it will remain on the sidelines of history.

I favor a unified CPSU and am against federalization.

A really major question—I believe that it will be developed in the report, and I am sure that this must be done at the 28th congress: "The need to convince people of the expediency of perestroyka and of the republics' remaining within the Union attests to the weakness of arguments and to serious omissions in these questions."

A correct comment. Indeed, comrades, particularly now that we have entered the phase of fundamental changes within the framework of the policy of perestroyka, we are deficient in such work. And the fact that we have just "thrown up" without preparation the question of a switch to a regulated economy and put it to a society which is in a very complex condition is also an example of how it is possible, generally speaking, to strike a blow at very major problems of politics. This problem must be covered prominently in the report at the 28th congress.

"The draft platform and the report clearly aired the idea that the party, and thus primarily the leadership, are lagging behind the process of democratization in society. But it is not clear why this has happened. No assessment has been made of the activities of Politburo members..." I believe that we have already begun making this assessment, including here at the congress, we have begun making an analysis, and it seems to me that we must make this whole range of problems the center of attention at the 28th congress. An attempt will in turn be made in the report, I believe, to evaluate all this.

"Why is the question of unfounded privileges for the apparatus being resolved only in the fifth year of perestroyka? The people were expecting a rapid moral cleansing of the party." A correct comment. What needed to be removed must be removed. And it has to be said in turn that generally this has no bearing on the majority of party members. (Applause).

And again. It is necessary only to distinguish what is laid down in law. Certain privileges and benefits have been established by the state and probably will continue to be so—and legislative work is now being done around them. The thing is that some people use their official position to abuse and appropriate illegal privileges. But people see everything. If it boils down to the need to decide the question connected, let us say, with dachas for Politburo members or with some other benefits, then of course this is not such a difficult task. And it has already been resolved. But it is also a fact that there all sorts of estates, principalities, and dukedoms all over the country.

There is no denying that there have been untouchable zones throughout the country. And there is still, so to speak, "regional comfort" in these areas. This continues to happen. Where, in that case, are the party members, I ask? Where is party control? Where is their formulation of the question? So let us see the matter through to the end. I support such an approach. Only what is laid down in law must remain.

Here Delegate Golitsyn says: "The report stated correctly that no one protected Russia against the infringement of its rights. They have admitted the fact of the economy's incorrect development and the poor orientation toward social needs. Tell us why you, as leader, failed to put a stop to those actions. Name the people specifically to blame," and two exclamation marks.

This is what I must tell you frankly. If you take a look at our many cadres at the center and in the republic, they are, as a rule, worthy people who have been taken and have come here from the provinces as the result of a democratic process. We have really selected the best. But as soon as a person has found himself in this functional system, he has begun to do what the system demanded. Therefore the question generally stands as follows: We must replace the model both of political leadership and of economic management—which is what you and I have tackled. If we do not do this, the system will put anyone in his place. Anyone. I assure you of this—on the basis of experience. And so it is necessary to do what you and I are doing. If we go seeking witches and enemies, that is wrong. It is another matter when someone has transgressed and broken the law—let him answer in accordance with the law. But on the whole we must take this path of perestroyka, comrades.

Comrades here recall that there was a promise to hold a conference of party gorkom and raykom first secretaries. A slipup in our work, I agree. It is necessary to rectify the matter, and a discussion is needed.

Question: "What, in your view, are the functions and tasks of the ruling party and its place and role in society under conditions of a multiparty system?"

We will endeavor to develop this theme at the 28th congress.

"What is your attitude to the attempt by a section of RSFSR people's deputies to implement a decision to ban party organizations in labor production collectives?" The Sakhalin delegation, three delegates.

I have already spoken about this. I believe that the party, by changing the style and forms of its work, has embarked on the path of democratization and renewal, on the path of separating functions. But it is not quitting a single sphere of the life of society. This is our concept of the party and our idea of building its activity, and I remain their advocate. I favor a vanguard type of party, not a parliamentary type. This is my profound conviction. (Applause).

"What is your attitude to Lenin's expression: 'Demagogues are the worst enemies of the working class'? Or was it topical only at that time?"

In my opinion, that expression is no less topical now. Therefore a political struggle must be waged decisively against demagogues, particularly those of a populist trend. A democratic struggle. And the people must be shown what they propose in actual fact and what they call for.

"What is your view of the Russian Communist Party Initiative Congress in Leningrad and its program statements on restoring the leading role of the CPSU and preserving the planned, administrative system in the economy? Comrade Kryukov."

You know, in general I look at the endeavors, even painful endeavors, that are taking place within the framework of the CPSU in the light of the awareness that they are impulses toward the need for us to discuss such questions and find ways of renewing the party. My approach is based mainly on that position. And I think I have already spoken on this topic when I spoke in Frunzenskiy Rayon, where I was elected delegate to the congress. I said that there is much that is positive and interesting in the Democratic Platform. But there are also unacceptable things: For instance, the parliamentary type of party or the existence of factions with their own internal discipline. I reject that. I do not agree with it in principle.

But the real point is: What objectives lie behind a given platform? Sociopolitical, socioeconomic objectives? Where are they leading us? That is another matter. You will not find that in the Democratic Platform itself. But when its supporters address different audiences, then it becomes clear that there are things that are unacceptable to us. But here too I think we acted correctly by giving the comrades, communists, reflecting the different currents that have sprung up within the CPSU, 15 minutes each to put their view in the form of supplementary reports at the congress—this is without precedent in our party's history. We have acted correctly.

About the initiative congress. It was concerned about the party's fate. This is what motivated the communists, who met a first time and a second time to exercise this concern. To make themselves heard within the CPSU. I welcome that. It is a responsible position. But I must say that there was a great deal of political speculation in connection with the congress. The congress organizers themselves gave interviews where, frankly, they launched attacks on the policy of perestroyka. I reject that. Because I am resolutely in favor of the choice we made in April. We need perestroyka if we want to keep pace with civilization. I do not think there is any need for me to dwell on this in detail now, Comrade Tyulkin has spoken and put forward ideas on the subject. Perhaps he went too far on some occasions, but to be honest, here on this platform, at this congress, not many people have avoided going too far. This is a tribute to the times, when some communists are now taking up the populists' methods, whereby the more strongly you criticize the top leadership, the greater your prestige. And you win a reputation for being bold and resolute. But this will all pass, the people will see through it. (Applause)

Question: "You said in the report that we will not allow anyone to interfere in our internal affairs. How are we to interpret the fact that the leaders of Western countries, in particular President Bush, are constantly making statements on Lithuania, linking our possible actions there with their position in relation to the USSR?"

Answer: This has not escaped our notice, but we certainly will not permit interference in our internal affairs. This was said to the President.

Question: "And a second point—the mujahidin, who have Pakistan and the United States behind them, are constantly interfering in the affairs of our Central Asian republics. What is your reaction to that?"

Answer: I am not going to answer this question now. Perhaps it is quite clear to some people, but the question is not clear to me. So for the moment I will keep it to myself.

Question: "Could you characterize in brief the future apparatus of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee? How will the CPSU Central Committee apparatus be reduced in this connection?"

Answer: A timely question. Now that the party has been created, there is all the more reason to think about this. We should form both the Central Committee and the apparatus first and foremost on the basis of the premise that we should not increase expenditure on the maintenance of the Central Committee apparatus and the future apparatus of the Russian Central Committee, but should even try to reduce such expenditure. Since the CPSU Central Committee has been responsible for these matters, it should share them, so to speak, fraternally. Second—what about premises? It should be in the CPSU Central Committee building, I think. That is, we should allocate a particular block of buildings and hand them over to the Russian Communist Party Central Committee. We should do everything on the basis of what is available, rather than building new premises, expanding staffs, and so forth. I think you agree with this. (Applause)

Question: "You call repeatedly for noninterference in the activity of sovkhozes and kolkhozes. So why do you not issue a temporary decree, say for two years, prohibiting anyone from interfering in the activity of farms that are leased, kolkhozes, and those collectives where the leaders have been elected on a contested basis? Ilchenko, from Novosibirsk Oblast."

Answer: Well, let us think about it. If a decree is necessary, I am willing. But I think the transition to the market system should in itself rule out such a situation of "universal interference."

Question: "What is the opinion of the first secretaries of Union republic Communist Parties on the formation of the RSFSR Central Committee?"

Answer: They welcome it, and view it with understanding.

Question: "Delegate Chumakov. When you announced perestroyka in April 1985, why did you not consult with the country's communists? A model of perestroyka should have been created, and mechanisms and priority tasks and subsequent tasks defined. You cannot experiment on a country, a people."

Answer: Comrades! I cannot accept such a charge against myself, against the Central Committee, or against the government—the country's entire leadership, which launched perestroyka. Imagine what would happen if we went to sleep today, and woke up tomorrow, and found a miracle had happened: One model had been replaced by another... You can see how we have progressed together and gained experience which has enabled us at last to embark on decisive steps in the political sphere and in the economy, in the federation and in the party itself! We could not have pictured all this realistically. There had been nothing like it in the party or in society. But there was an awareness of the need for change. That everything must be radically changed. And a concept, an intention arose: Within the framework of the socialist choice, to impart new breath, to uncover the potential of the socialist system by overcoming the alienation of man from power, from ownership, from culture. It was within the framework of this concept, this intention, that the quest began, the process of acquiring experience in all areas.

At first we wanted to achieve new labor productivity and a new level of growth in national income solely by means of accelerating scientific and technical progress, and thus to solve the accumulated problems. It did not work. And that was in spite of the fact that in the 12th Five-Year Plan capital investments in the development of the machine building complex increased 70 percent. It did not work. People started building the old approaches into the projects. In order to stop this happening, so as not to waste money on the old ways, we formed independent expert groups, and they started assessing the projects. It still did not work. Quality—how could we make people produce better output, in our monopoly conditions? We set up the system of state control, state acceptance. That is, we kept trying all the time. And you know, we realized that nothing would work, unless we changed economic relations themselves.

Yes, it is for you to judge, but do not judge hastily. I say that to return to the topic raised—in detail, so to speak.

Then we embarked on economic accountability and self-management and adopted the Law on Enterprises. Again, it does not work out. Because everything became bogged down on account of the political superstructure, the administrative edict system, which would not allow the basic component to operate. Then we came to the 19th party conference with the proposal on political reform. And so on, and so forth... It is a very serious, profound process. Only Jesus Christ could feed 20,000 people with five loaves—no other case of everything being solved so simply has been heard of. This is a difficult endeavor. But we have embarked on a path of fundamental changes which will ultimately lead us onto the highway of renewal. I am convinced of that. It will lead us there, provided, of course, that we now act resolutely and understand each other.

"We believe that in order to stabilize the economic situation in the country it is necessary urgently to adopt measures in the sphere of discipline in production. A resolute step by you is extremely important here—a presidential decree on discipline. We have confidence in your determination and courage."

Well, that is a hint. (Animation in the auditorium.)

But I do not really know: Are you advocating decrees such as we had in 1940, on the eve of the war? Who is stopping you from putting things to rights? There are laws, there is the labor code, there is the labor collective council—what is the problem?

I will tell you this: As soon as we create a new economic environment—by achieving a regulated market—and as soon as we create a real situation in which everyone can earn money and live on what he earns and compete for the market, for better quality, then, I am telling you straight, no collective will tolerate an idler. None. And this is the path that must be followed, the path we have embarked on. It is the surest and most effective path. But it does not do away with educational and administrative measures, such as our laws offer today.

Question. "Statements by representatives of the Armed Forces have blamed the government and the Communist Party leadership for weakening the country's defense. Please be so kind as to reply to the delegates."

Answer: I do not think we should confuse the two issues. The fact that perestroyka has also affected that very important institution, our Soviet Army, is objective and true. The fact that within the framework of implementation of the policy of disarmament we have set about reforming the Army and are moving toward reform—that is all dictated by the stage reached by society, the situation, and the Armed Forces themselves. All these are normal processes taking place in the Army in the context of major changes in and around the country. We have to do it.

But this does not in the least mean that we should show less interest in the Army, in the Armed Forces. Moreover I have said before and I publicly repeat yet again: The people cannot and will not keep a government for a single year if it does not understand the army's significance and its role in the country's life and in ensuring its security and peaceful, tranquil labor. This question has been expressed and accepted once and for all for us.

And the leadership that heads the country today understands this and acts in accordance with that understanding.

Disarmament and troop reductions affect the Army, affect real people. And these processes must be pursued very responsibly. There should be a government program here. We approved the program for two years, and then, in this tight time frame, we realized that we had not thought everything through. The situation grew complex, the officers realized this and put these questions before us urgently.

I think they are right. In this connection the Defense Ministry, on the basis of the president's instructions, has drawn up and has already submitted to the government a government program for resolving the accumulated problems in the sphere of the social provision and security of our officer corps, which we should be concerned with. Everyone should be concerned with this, comrades—in all the republics, in all the cities, in all the regions.

After discussion, we will adopt this program without fail and we will monitor it. Moreover, we envisage that the Army itself will participate in the solution of these questions, utilizing its potential and the resources that are made available.

Have our defenses weakened or not? We are acting on principle, on the basis of our doctrine of reasonable sufficiency and we are doing everything within the framework of this doctrine. I cannot agree with those who would conclude that we are being negligent or that we have already allowed defenses to weaken. This is not true. If there is criticism by generals or officers, or anyone else and if there have been omissions anywhere, then this must be examined. But, in principle, I can confirm today—if anyone thinks differently, let him stand up and say so—that our defenses are secure. We are neither adventurists nor simpletons who would make any cheap deals in these matters. We would not allow that. Everything must be on an equal footing.

But when I say "on an equal footing," it does not mean that if they have a certain number of a particular kind of weapon we have to have the same number of new weapons and so on. No, it is all more complicated than that, of course. We have tanks, for example, and they have something else. We have ground-based heavy missiles, they have submarines and heavy bombers. Each has his own specific features and peculiarities. It is a question of not allowing a lowering of the balance, the strategic balance. That is the crux of the matter.

They say that America is carrying out plans to modernize weapons. We are too. The Army must be a modern army. It must have a competent, able officer corps and reliable, modern weapons. All armies do this, ours as well. We are doing everything necessary for research, for the future, for the solution of long-term tasks, in order not to disrupt parity. Is it difficult? Yes. Is it difficult finding the funds? Yes. But that is another matter. These are our approaches.

My final point. Dear comrades, we have gotten to the point where, at certain periods, up to 18 percent of the national income has been spent on the upkeep of the Armed Forces. No other developed state in the world spends that much. I will be frank and say that the policy we are conducting, the policy of new thinking, and the course of disarmament, of moving away from confrontation and of lowering military confrontation, has met with universal support. And not because this or that president is a good one. But because even an economy like the American economy was unable to sustain the arms race. America has a domestic debt of more than two trillion and a foreign debt of 350 billion! That is the situation. The path of confrontation is a futile path, the path to disaster. It is a good thing that the whole world has responded to new thinking and this process has begun to bear fruit. One must be very responsible. One must discuss these matters competently instead of standing in front of any microphone amd hurling accusations. (Applause).

Comrades have criticized the Academy of Social Sciences and the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and have proposed the establishment of major new scientific research centers which would help the party tackle theoretical and political matters. I believe this proposal is correct.

There are many more questions to be dealt with; I have just received some new ones. I will try to give prominence to all the most important, fundamental matters in the report at the 28th congress.

What do I want to say in conclusion? It has been an important discussion at the congress. I would not say that it has left everyone feeling cheerful. On the contrary. I think that the delegates have brought home to the congress, to the country's leadership, and, indeed, to the people the full gravity of the current sociopolitical situation in the country, which requires a great deal of active and constructive work by the party and collaboration with the soviets, with other social and political movements, and with labor collectives. From this viewpoint, the congress was exacting and principled.

Second. How is the conflict of opinion that we sensed here, at this forum, to be regarded? It seems to me that, having said this and having established that there are conflicting positions on some matters—very important ones, in fact, in terms of assessing the country's situation and prospects—our chief conclusion must be that we must invite people to consolidate our party, not split it. It is necessary to utilize all the constructive elements in all the positions that have been set out here in order to consolidate our forces and—via the party—the forces of society in the mainstream of perestroyka.

It is necessary to get rid of extremism, on the left, on the right, or wherever. And I would like us to go away from this congress, the Constituent Congress of the RSFSR Communist Party, with that very conclusion. Because I am getting information, I see that people and delegates, and not only delegates, feel that the way the congress went allegedly shows that it is necessary to part company. It seems to me the people's goals, tasks, situations, and concerns and their feelings are such that Communists must do their level best to meet one another half way, in order to consolidate both the party and society. This, comrades, is the paramount task. If someone wants to pillory someone else and gain satisfaction from it, I will tell you frankly: It is not on.

Does this mean that we must retreat from our principled positions and act in a way that is detrimental to the path we have chosen? No. I believe that within the framework of the socialist choice we have vast potential for cooperation and this must be emphasized at our congress.

A split in the party would lead to very serious polarization of social forces, and this would weaken all the country's constructive forces. At the decisive stage of perestroyka this is a gift to those who want to wreck perestroyka and defeat it.

Third. People are expecting practical solutions. For various reasons—I have already tried to explain this—we have not yet gotten as far as examining the specific problems that have to be solved. We will start doing this at the 28th congress and continue at the second stage of this congress. We must give our people the answers. They have a right to expect answers. What the working class and peasants want to hear above all is what we are going to say about the fundamental questions of life and perestroyka at the 28th congress.

We must use the time that remains to think about this, at Central Committee level and at delegation level, and come to the congress with a stock of constructive proposals on this score. To be frank, from the viewpoint of criticism, our congress excelled itself. From the viewpoint of constructive proposals it leaves much to be desired. We are very strong when it comes to teaching lessons of principle and revealing shortcomings—particularly on the part of neighbors or bosses. But we are very low on constructiveness. What we must think about is enriching this part of the debate at the 28th congress.

Comrades! Let us stop confusing our own personal discomfort, things that have offended us, with what the people are experiencing. We must set aside our own feelings and gear ourselves to what concerns the people. I receive hundreds of telegrams, people saying: Why don't you stop settling scores and put more thought into tackling the backlog of problems more swiftly. It is time for specific, practical deeds. This we must also bear in mind.

I want to express immense satisfaction that this debate has actually taken place. We must think about all these things. And we must go to the 28th congress with the intention of enriching it. If we draw this conclusion, the Russian Communist Party and the delegates will do the essential work. If we go the other way, the congress, the entire party, the entire country, the people, and perestroyka will suffer. One would hope that having synchronized watches here and spoken frankly to one another, we will reflect and disperse with an understanding of what exactly we, Russians, have to do to ensure the success of the 28th congress, which our people are counting on. Thank you. (Applause).

'Negative Reactions' to Congress Reported

LD2606161490 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1516 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 26 (TANJUG)—The victory of the conservatives at the founding congress of the Communist Party of Russia and the election of the conservative wing's member Ivan Polozkov as party first secretary have already encountered negative reactions within the party.

The coordinating committee of the "Democratic Platform in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" for the Moscow area late last night sent an appeal to the Russian communists, who were holding the closing session of the founding congress, setting out that the "reactionary-conservative overthrow" which had taken place at the congress was aimed at suppressing the democratic processes in the party.

The coordinating committee urged the Russian communists not to recognize the decisions of the Russian party congress and to refuse joining the newly formed party, that is, to insist that membership in the Communist Party of Russia must be voluntary and not automatic. The committee also urged the Russian communists to refuse paying the party membership fee.

New similar reactions are expected here from different parts of Russia. The Communist Party of Russia has 10.5 million members, that is, it accounts for around 60 per cent of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union members.

Institution Group Refuses To Join Russian Party

LD2706111790 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] The INTERFAX correspondent reports that at a party meeting held on 25 June in the Information Transmission Problems Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, it was decided to regard as invalid the transformation of the Russian Party Conference into the inaugural Congress of the Communist Party of Russia. Since the decision to establish the Communist Party of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] was adopted by an unconstitutional body, the resolution states, the institutes' party organization disagrees with the inaugural congress's decision to transfer that organization to the Communist Party of the RSFSR, and it therefore remains within the CPSU. The meeting adopted a decision to suspend payment of membership dues into the budget of the Communist Party of Russia.

Communists Reportedly Leaving Russian Party

LD2706005890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2136 GMT 26 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program presented by Yuriy Rostov]

[Excerpt] Quite a few reports about communists leaving the Russian Communist Party reached us today. According to the POSTFAKTUM agency, such a decision was announced in particular by the Leningrad program "Pyatoye Koleso" [Fifth Wheel]. The reason for this is that, in the journalists' view, the Russian Communist Party was formed as a party of the Nina Andreyeva type. [passage omitted]

Congress Speech Urges Unifying Role for Party

PM2606161190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Jun 90 Single Edition p 2

[Speech by O.S. Shenin, first secretary of Krasnoyarsk Kraykom [kray party committee], at the 20 June evening sitting of the RSFSR Communist Party Congress, under general headline "Discussion of Report 'With Responsibility for the Fate of Russia and the Whole Country'"]

[Text] Comrades! Now, when Russian communists have assembled for their own congress, it is appropriate to recall Lenin's letter to the 12th Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress, which began with these words: "I would strongly advise you to use this congress to make a number of changes in our political system." Vladimir Ilich was deeply concerned about the party's future and its combat ability and efficiency. He saw an urgent need to draw together the party's "upper" and "lower" echelons and do everything possible to ensure the Central Committee's stability and the party's unity, which would strengthen its ties with the masses and allow it to implement a new economic policy. Lenin's advice to Russian communists has not lost its relevance.

How can the perestroyka begun in 1985 be brought to its logical conclusion? How, despite the difficulties and opposition from right and left, can society be led along the path of renewal, appreciating the historical responsibility for the end result of this complex, unique, but objectively necessary process?

There are no easy answers to these agonizing questions. The first point that must be firmly made is that the party is making a decisive, Leninist break with dogmatism in theory and voluntarism in policy and is basing its activity on the developing methodology of Marxism-Leninism and the fruits of progressive social thought throughout the world.

The party is now being told to repent, and liquidationist themes are doing the rounds. Yes, agonizing mistakes and miscalculations have been made even since April 1985. Many of them have been made in the economy. The introduction of unverified innovations without considering the contradictory nature of any given phenomena has brought the economy to the brink. There is no doubt that the blame for this rests with the party leadership and the country's government, which have sometimes unthinkingly followed the advice of economists and succumbed to pressure from the press. Essentially, following this course has in the last two years given rise to galloping inflation and thrown the money market into disarray. But they are not the only ones to blame: Many agreed, many encouraged, even when they realised the weakness of the resolutions on the taxation of cooperatives or the Law on the State Enterprise and saw the spasmodic attempts at switching to regional economic accountability. At present we do not have sufficient objective analysis of these failures. The reason we need this analysis is certainly not to settle scores but, to use Lenin's words, to correctly determine our policies for the future and find the right, coordinated path to follow. The main conclusion that suggests itself is this: We should not repent and disband, as that would be a betrayal to all generations of communists and all the people; we must learn from what has happened and, by consolidating society and progressive political forces, put our house in order. Russian communists have one of the leading roles in this process. Consequently (and this is the second conclusion), the formation of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party is the both the demand of the times and an objective necessity. In this respect, only full understanding of the danger of pulling the CPSU apart can create the conditions under which the Russian Communist Party will play an important role in renewing and strengthening the whole of the CPSU.

So, what kind of party should it be? First and foremost it must be a party of the working class, the peasantry, and the people's intelligentsia, a party that defends socialism. It must be a party that follows the will of the party masses. It must be a party with a totally clear program, a party of democratic centralism that is free forever from the fetters of Stalinism, a party in which every communist has a real possibility to influence policy. It must be a party with strong internal discipline based on ideological and organizational unity. Its structure must be simple and determined by party organizations at local level. It must take a new approach to forming its leading bodies and decide the optimum size of its apparatus. Its action program must be based on the conceptual principle that not only does it not renounce its political work and influence in society but strives for priority in this sphere through its practical actions—not entreaties, comrades, but practical actions. The revived Communist Party must truly be the party of the people, eradicate the elitism of leadership once and for all, and be able to cooperate with popular movements and organizations and quickly and surely consolidate its forces at critical moments. It must work in a politically competent fashion in the soviets and with the soviets at all levels and conduct parliamentary activity. All this is acquiring special importance with the transition to a regulated market economy.

In my view, the Russian Communist Party must have a Politburo and standing commissions headed by Central Committee secretaries.

The Communist Party must broadly discuss draft action programs and the most important decisions with the nonparty masses, and primarily among the working class and the working peasantry.

Russian communists must not only preserve but substantially strengthen primary party organizations in labor collectives. They must be real centers of political work, respond quickly to the mood of the masses, uphold their interests in a principled manner, and participate in new structures of the workers and peasant movement. It is essential to enhance their status, rights, and independence, ensure strong ties with party bodies at all levels and direct involvement in their formation, and give them the right to make the final decisions regarding the admission of new members and distribution of financial resources.

The above gives some real substance to an as yet abstract slogan: "Power to the party masses."

When determining strategic and tactical tasks we must not forget those indispensable conditions which made the party really Leninist and clearly different from other parties in Vladimir Ilich's lifetime. I am referring to relations between party members.

Party members' characteristic loyalty, attention to one another, politeness, humanity, and, finally, the heart of party comradeship have dissolved in bitter disputes and accusations.

As the largest communist detachment in the country, the RSFSR Communist Party is expected to serve as a reliable buttress for the CPSU and its Central Committee, closely collaborate with the Union republic communist parties, and establish in practice the principles of internationalism—the pivot around which our multiethnic state must be built.

There is one point I would like to dwell on in particular. Politicians, sociologists, and publicists point to the growth in centrifugal forces and the rapid stratification of society. On the one hand, this is an objective dialectical process. But, on the other, in our attempts to seek out the causes of the social, national, and party crises, are we not ourselves dividing society and the public—and, moreover, dividing them publicly, for all the world to see—along vertical, horizontal, and diagonal lines, placing people in national categories, social cells, groups, and strata, and virtually dividing them up on the basis of sex and height?

The party must make the achievement of civic accord its main, most immediate objective. It must stop any further demarcation on arbitrary grounds and channel all forces into consolidation for the sake of creation. The party will be able to achieve this if it is not destroyed.

Three angles of attack on the party are now clearly apparent. The first is that the party is failing to keep pace; the second is that it is not transferring power to the soviets; and the third is that the apparatus has crushed elected bodies underfoot, with mention also being made of the party's financial base. You do not have to be a great expert on politics to argue that this is not quite true, to put it mildly. You could give examples of where we are rushing ahead too quickly. You could contend that we have surrendered power—and surrendered it quickly—but that there is no one to take it, because the soviets still lack the appropriate structures.

But, finally, there is also a fourth angle of attack, which we are creating ourselves. Aware that it is very difficult to inspire confidence and accord at such a tense time, many are rushing to demolish everyone and everything, forgetting that an excess of criticism and bitterness are even more destructive to society than a shortage of these things. This is apparent in the attitude toward the party general secretary, when comradely criticism is replaced by noisy, insulting irresponsibility. Of course, everyone is free to choose his path of salvation on his own, but he should not lose his dignity in so doing. And it is desirable to remember that personal salvation is not the same thing as salvation for the country, the people, and the party. Let us differ at least a little from other forums. (Applause)

We must gather together all healthy forces and unite them. This role—a uniting role—must be played by our congress and by all Russian communists, and this unifiying impetus must be conveyed to the 28th CPSU Congress.

Yes, there are various platforms in the party but there is one main point we have in common: Our people, the fate of Russia, and the fate of the whole country are dear to us. That is the platform on which we must unite and stand firm. (Applause)

Gorbachev Interviewed on Russian Party Congress

NC2306164590 Athens RIZOSPASTIS in Greek 23 Jun 90 p 3

[Report on interview with Mikhail Gorbachev, USSR president and CPSU general secretary, by Ioannis Litsos in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] My conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev was not planned. It was one of those "lucky breaks" in the life of a reporter. During a long interval at the founding congress of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party, I was waiting outside the hall to interview some people about the congress. Suddenly I saw Gorbachev coming toward me, together with other members of the Soviet leadership. They were going into a nearby room, where they were to meet with some delegates to the congress. I seized this opportunity and said:

[Litsos] I am from the Greek newspaper RIZOSPASTIS. Mikhail Sergeyevich, can you assess the course of the founding congress of the RSFSR Communist Party thus far?

[Gorbachev] You speak Russian very well. How come?

[Litsos] Thank you. I have been in the Soviet Union for many years now. I have been my newspaper's correspondent in Moscow for 15 years.

[Gorbachev] I see. And now to answer your question: The RSFSR Communist Party Congress is a very important event when we consider the leading role the RSFSR and its people play in the life of our country.

Radical changes are taking place in the RSFSR, as they are in the rest of the Soviet Union. I can tell you that here too emphasis was placed on the sovereignty of the RSFSR and the need to release its potential to serve the interests of the people who live on its land and, naturally, the interests of the entire country.

It is clear that the course the RSFSR takes will have a profound influence on the entire Soviet Union.

[Litsos] How do you assess the speeches made at the congress so far?

[Gorbachev] I am satisfied by the fact that the majority of the speakers are in favor of perestroyka. There are differences over methods, over how we should go about things and what must be given priority, but that is another issue. All the speakers are in favor of perestroyka, in favor of strengthening our union, and in favor of a renewed and united RSFSR. This is the view of the Russian Communists. This is what I think is important. Everything else only reflects a pluralism of views.

[Litsos] Do you have a message for the readers of our newspaper?

[Gorbachev] I send my best wishes and regards to the readers of your newspaper and to all the Greek people.

Supreme Soviet Official Appointment Reported

PM1906110790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

["RSFSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on the Appointment of the RSFSR Chief State Arbitrator"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] resolves:

To appoint Comrade Nikolay Pavlovich Zarubin RSFSR Chief State Arbitrator.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet
Moscow, RSFSR House of Soviets.
15 June 1990.

New Leningrad City Chairman Elected 18 June

PM2506095190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Vladimir Nevelskiy: "New Leningrad Gorispolkom Chairman Elected"]

[Text] Leningrad—In the first round of voting at the Leningrad City Soviet 18 June USSR People's Deputy Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Shchelkanov was elected chairman of the Leningrad Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee].

This event took place after the new Leningrad City Soviet had already been working for three months. When it was proposed to elect the city mayor on a competitive basis and the local press published the terms of competition it turned out that there were a great many people anxious to hold this post. Engineers and doctors, philosophers and architects, higher educational establishment teachers and enterprise leaders, servicemen and cooperative chairmen considered themselves prepared for the laborious work of mayor. In all 40 people submitted documents for the competition.

Under the competition's terms a candidate for mayor had to have higher education, experience of leading work, and a precise program of action.

Ultimately the competition commission nominated five people as candidate mayors. Of the 269 Leningrad City Soviet deputies 212 voted for A.A. Shchelkanov.

A few words about the new city mayor. He was born in 1939 in Leningrad and graduated from the shipbuilding institute here and a few years later from the Moscow military institute of foreign languages. Last year he was elected a USSR people's deputy. He is a nonparty person. He has two sons: One is a student, the other a pupil at the shipbuilding institute college.

Sverdlovsk Oblast Chairman Forced To Resign

LD2606174490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Nadezhda Potapova]

[Text] Sverdlovsk, 26 Jun (TASS)—Vladimir Vlasov, chairman of the Sverdlovsk Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies was obliged to resign today at the suggestion of the deputies. The question of confidence in him was raised before the routine session started, at the demand of the voters in connection with the results of Vlasov's work and conduct at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] First Congress of People's Deputies.

The majority of the people of the Urals gave their delegation the mandate to support Boris Yeltsin at the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies for the national-territorial district, in his struggle for the post of chairman of the Russian parliament and his proposals for a democratic, intellectual and national rebirth of Russia. However, even before the start of the congress, at a conference of representatives of deputies at the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Oblast Soviet Vlasov described his colleague discourteously, adding that this view was shared by "many Sverdlovskites."

The voters and the oblast soviet deputies thought that disregarding the views of the masses, their mandates, and also the opportunism in the conduct of the leader of one of the RSFSR's major oblasts would not assist the consolidation of forces and the fruitfulness of the forthcoming difficult job of bringing the republic out of the crisis.

The session of the oblast soviet of people's deputies voted for the resignation of its chairman by a majority of votes.

Outdated Technology, Equipment Cause Poisonings

LD2706052590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Text] Probably after the publication of today's PRAVDA—now I shall tell you about it—the deputies will consider it necessary to talk about not only the quantity of goods but also about their quality.

It would seem that nothing could be safer than ice cream. It is not poisonous, is it? But it looks as if surprises now await us around every corner. In the last few days in the neighboring towns of Tolyatti and Zhigulevsk, 325 people have been hospitalized. Of them, 224 are children. They had all eaten ice cream and drunk milk. (Sukhobukov), the chairman of the oblast extraordinary anti-epidemic commission, explains the situation like this. The dairy industry of Kuybyshev Oblast has truly become an (?expression) of delayed action. Failure to observe the correct technology and broken equipment are leading to regrettable consequences. This time it was negligent carelessness on the part of the staff. The rules for heat treatment of the milk were not observed at the Tolyatti dairy factory No. 1. Part of it went to the ice cream factory. And as a result, there has been an outbreak of gastrointestinal disease and some children are in a serious condition. For the moment, deliveries of milk to Tolyatti and the northern zone of the oblast have been stopped. Throughout the weekend, veterinary staff have been investigating the situation. Double sterilization of products is being carried out to avoid risk.

All that has been said was reflected at the session of the extraordinary industrial antiepidemic commission at the end of last week.

But you have to agree that you and I do not feel any better because of such talks and sessions. You see, the emergency situation occurred at a new enterprise which is fitted with splendid imported equipment. But what can be said about the remaining equipment which has not been repaired for ages, where the level of discipline with respect to technology does not stand up to any kind of criticism at all. At the present time, after numerous transformations of ministries, Soviet equipment for the dairy industry is hardly being manufactured. And as you know, there is no foreign currency for imported equipment.

Comparison on Russian Party Adopts Appeal

PM2506104790

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 24 June 1990 carries in its Second Edition on page 1 the RSFSR Communist Party Congress "Appeal to the Communists and Peoples of Russia." Comparison of the PRAVDA item with the translation of the Moscow TASS International Russian version published in the 25 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, beginning on page 98, reveals the following variations:

Page 98, column two, seventh paragraph of item, single sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...the working people, more insistently resolve tasks of uniting the peoples of the Russian Federation, and consolidate the actions of... (rewording);

Page 99, column one, first full paragraph, last sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...program of the phased implementation of the transfer to a regulated market economy. [new paragraph]

We appeal to Communist members of... (rewording, adding "market," omitting "all");

Page 99, column one, fourth full paragraph, last sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...Republic of Soviets—an inheritance which subordinates all its activity to improving... (rewording).

Western Republics

Report on Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Proceedings

LD2606202290 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 25 Jun 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Today, after a long week's break, the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine resumed its work. [passage omitted] The deputies decided to elect chairman of the Ukraine's Council of Ministers. Chairman of the Ukraine's Supreme Soviet Vladimir Ivashko used his right to nominate a candidature to this post and proposed a people's deputy: Vitaliy Masol. Speaking before the deputies, Vitaliy Masol in part said the following:

[Begin Masol recording in Ukrainian with superimposed english translation] As a major and determining condition for a stable social and economic development of the republic, of spiritual progress of its nation, I consider economic sovereignty of the Ukraine. The wealth of the republic, its material and financial resources, everything produced on its territory, should belong to the Ukraine's people and should be used in the interests of the people. We, the deputies, have to adopt immediately the law on economic independence of the Ukraine and then the government will have to make all enterprises and organizations located on its territory be subjected to the republic itself.

I consider proclaiming of the Ukraine's economic sovereignty not as an act of separation, but a step to a real formation of the Soviet Federation of a new type. This federation has to be based on the interactive harmony, economically grounded distribution of labor, equivalent exchange of produce among the Union republics, construction of the Union on the treaty foundations, legal and real guarantees of sovereignty of its members. In this federation, there should be no place for the diktat from the center. [end recording]

[Announcer] The speech of the contender for the post of prime minister of the republic revealed the reasons for such a tough economic sitution taking place currently in the Ukraine. Deputy Vitaliy Masol was repeatedly stressing that both he himself and the government headed by him are ready to take upon themselves all the responsibility for numerous omissions. It is necessary to find practically new ways for real economic progress and prosperity in the Ukraine, said Vitaliy Masol. The ways which would destroy command and bureaucratic system and demolish total egoistic character of administrative apparatus, the ways which would give the birth to business initiative at all levels.

Just after the speech, the people's deputies began putting questions to the contender, but today the parliament didn't have enough time for such a dialogue, and the deputies decided to continue it after the break.

During the break between the sittings we asked the participants of today's plenary meeting to share their opinions concerning the destiny of a new staff of the republican government. [passage omitted]

It had seemed to me the majority of the people's deputies, having heard the brief speech of the contender for the post of prime ministers of the Ukraine, in one way or another accepted it as a program of the new government. But it wasn't so. The deputy Vitaliy Masol only singled out the main guidelines of activity of the new government. So let us listen to the opinions of the deputies in relation this point. Says Deputy Oleksandr Kulinets from the city of Ternopol:

[Begin Kulinets recording in Ukrainian with superimposed English translation] At the beginning of our session, we heard the report by Vitaliy Masol on behalf of the government. And then many critical comments were addressed to him and the government in general. And I'm surprised that after all that, Vladimir Ivashko nominated Masol to such a high position. I think it is irresponsible. I believe that in the time of restructuring and transition towards sovereignty, the government should be headed by a radically new person. I think we have the alternative. There are quite a few economists of world calibre and among them I can name Academician Yukhnovskiy. [end recording]

[Announcer] Next is the opinion of Deputy Andriy Bondarchuk from Volyn:

[Begin Bondarchuk recording in Ukrainian with superimposed English translation] I will be voting against, because these are old kind of people with the old kind of approaches. I cannot trust the government because of the situation that has been formed and which we're all witnessing. Vitaliy Masol doesn't suggest anything new except the market economy. But in suggesting market economy, Masol has omitted many issues. Namely those of social protection. He didn't even say a word in this regard. I don't know what will happen. Shall we have millions of unemployed? If so, how should we compensate those losses? How will they feed their families? [end recording]

[Announcer] And one more opinion by Deputy Tatyana Yeheyeva from Chernigov:

[Begin Yeheyeva recording in Ukrainian with superimposed English translation] [passage omitted] We should take into consideration that both Masol and his predecessor Lyashko failed to organize the ecological protection of Ukraine's population after the Chernobyl nuclear plant disaster. This brings forth a fair deal of concern and I don't have a final decision. The position of head of government is too responsible. [end recording]

[Announcer] The participants in today's session thoroughly discussed the nomination of Vitaliy Masol as head of Ukrainian government. However, when it came to expressing the vote of confidence to the prime minister, the representatives of the People's Council—the official opposition in Ukrainian parliament—refused to vote. They were dissatisfied by the new government's program. Nevertheless, the voting did take place. As a result of the voting, Vitaliy Masol did not obtain the required amount of votes.

Masol Not Reelected

PM2706130190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by Sergey Tsikora under the "Direct Line" rubric: "A Few Votes Short"]

[Text] Kiev—The deputies considered the election of the head of government to be the priority question on the agenda of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet session which has reopened after a short intermission.

Parliamentarians had a simple explanation for the priority of this question: Because of upsets in the supply of gasoline, transport has already come to a standstill in some places in the republic. While the government has not been formed in the center, the harvesting toil has begun here and telegrams requesting aid are coming in from local areas .

Using his legal right to nominate a candidate premier, V. Ivashko, chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, suggested appointing to this post V. Masol, who has headed the republic's cabinet of ministers in recent difficult years, describing his candidacy as the best for the transitional period. In this situation promising results may be expected from a specialist with great economic experience and the intention to improve the economy.

V. Masol came out with a program for the republic's economic recovery. You formed the impression from his speech that the contender not only knows what to do for the economy's recovery but also how to implement these plans in practice. At any rate he was not "let down" on a single one of the questions which the prime minister is usually in charge of personally.

The secret ballot was scheduled for the end of the discussion of the candidacy—and it lasted a whole day. The results were as follows: Some 214 deputies voted for V. Masol's election and 146 voted against. But this was not enough to approve the premier in his post. He had to receive a minimum of 226 votes (there are 450 deputies in the Ukrainian parliament). An important fact which cannot be kept quiet: At the time of the vote, to the contender's misfortune, there were 90 deputies absent from the Supreme Soviet! Of course, such a massive "nonappearance" could not fail to influence the results of the vote.

More on Elections

LD2606203190 Moscow TASS in English 1951 GMT 26 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Stanislav Volnyanskiy]

[Text] Kiev June 26 TASS—Members of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet failed to elect a prime minister today, rejecting both choices of Ukrainian President Vladimir Ivashko.

Ivashko first nominated for the post Vitaliy Masol, who has been Ukrainian prime minister since 1987.

Masol's nomination caused fierce debate at the session, with some deputies praising his leadership and boldness in tackling problems, while the democratic block accused him of the current economic crisis in the republic.

The results of a secret vote revealed that Masol fell short of just 12 votes.

The discussion of Vitold Fokin, Ivashko's second choice, was calm, and he seemed well on course to win the nomination, but was also rejected.

Deputies decided to discuss possible candidates at meetings of territorial groups and return to the issue at their next meeting.

Report on Fifth Day of Ukrainian Party Congress

PM2606144190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov "Notes from the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress": "In the Public Eye"]

[Text] This is the fifth day of the congress' work. Discussion of the accountability report "On the Political Situation and the Main Avenues of Ukrainian Communist Party Activity at the Contemporary Stage" delivered by V.A. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, developed into a constructive debate. A considerable amount of time was spent discussing the agenda and amendments to it, the result being that the number of items on the agenda has virtually doubled.

Speakers voiced varying opinions of the report, and there is nothing surprising in that. In the last five years the republic's party organization has covered difficult ground, and this was reflected in the report and the speeches.

"Five years ago," the speaker said, "the party began the radical perestroyka of our society. The course elaborated by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 19th all-Union party conference met with extensive backing among the people. However, life proved far more complex and contradictory than expected. The hopes of being able to change things for the better in a short period were not realized."

Dwelling on the situation in society and the party, V.A. Ivashko pointed out that more and more problems are cropping up along the path of renewal, while conflicts and contradictions that were driven deep in the past are coming to the surface in public life. The population's living conditions have become considerably complicated. People are losing their confidence in the future and it is hard to tell them why there are growing shortages, inflation, and so on. The environmental situation, which reached critical level after the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station], is depressing. National and religious intolerance is being roused artificially. The increase in crime is a cause of general concern.

The main thing is that more and more people, united in their realization of the need for radical change, are actively joining in the perestroyka processes. However, conservatism, mental unreadiness for profound transformations, and freeloading, leveling sentiments are getting in the way. Leftism that refuses to take account of real possibilities and urges on the irresponsible acceleration of social processes or just blind destruction is manifesting itself in an extremely menacing way. Attempts are being made to wreck the prestige of institutions of power, and management structures are depicted as completely bureaucratic, the sole reason being that they exist.

Forces have appeared on the political scene that aspire to take the lead, but nonetheless fail to recognize any moral norms and see the principle of pluralism as a call for a wild rampage of passions and glasnost as an opportunity to sling mud at everyone and everything. It is clear that this prevents the affirmation of civilized norms of political life. The overwhelming majority of new political formations generally proclaim their commitment to democracy, progress, and perestroyka. Things often turn out differently in practice.

Today, people said at the congress, many "informal" organizations can already be said to be turning into parties. They have various aims—from moderate, generally democratic ones to overtly antisocialist and anti-Soviet aims. The Ukrainian Republican Party, which has declared communist ideology and practice "essentially antihuman and unnatural," is a blatantly antisocialist force. The Independent Ukrainian Youth League, which holds explicit anticommunist positions, has close links with the former in the ideological sense. The Communist Party has entered a period of overt political struggle, which is becoming increasingly acute. That is why it is an exceptionally important task for the party congress to elaborate contemporary tactics and strategy for the Ukrainian Communist Party's activity in conditions of a multiparty system. It is faced with the problem of seeking allies and cooperating with everyone who recognizes life's realities and focuses policy on the people's interests and the future of the Ukraine. In delegates' opinion, this type of cooperation could be a kind of modern incarnation of the Bolshevik tactic of the "leftist bloc," the principles of which were elaborated by Lenin.

Analyzing the current political period, the speakers also pointed out certain new phenomena in the workers movement and the confrontation between various so-called "independent" workers' organizations. The Communist Party has no right to remain aloof, it is its duty to gain a deeper knowledge of, and to more resolutely uphold working people's interests. Aware of this, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, along with its Politburo and Secretariat, as was noted at the congress, have endeavored to organize their activity in the appropriate fashion during the period under review. The Central Committee is now doing everything in full view of the party masses, and openness in its work—including live relays of plenums—has never been as extensive.

Party cadres have been substantially renewed. During the period under review, all obkom [oblast party committee] first secretaries, the Kiev Gorkom [city party committee] first secretary, and 80 percent of secretaries were replaced for various reasons, along with approximately 60 percent of party gorkom and raykom [rayon party committee] first secretaries. They were democratically elected with due consideration for the opinion of communists and the public. The Central Committee opposed attempts camouflaging as debates to split the Communist Party from within and to create parallel structures. The emergence of various platforms is natural, delegates said, but differences of opinions on questions of tactics are no excuse for rigid confrontation.

Meanwhile it was emphasized that the Ukrainian Communist Party's current activity by no means fully accords with the features of the political period and the tasks of renewing society. The Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat have permitted a considerable number of miscalculations. Reacting in most cases to current events and phenomena, the Ukrainian Communist Party leadership were more concerned with questions of tactics than strategy and did not always provide a timely and correct assessment of the political situation, which caused its exacerbation in a number of oblasts—even leading to the resignation of party obkom first secretaries. Decisions were worked out in haste and were therefore frequently ineffective. The Central Committee was also reproached for failing to establish lasting working ties with local organizations, committees, and the party aktiv, and failing to surmount such phenomena as the decline in party discipline and the party masses' mistrust of their leading organs. In the first five months of this year more than 28,000 people handed in their party documents. Although this is less than one percent of the party's total membership, the Ukrainian Communist Party has never experienced such a great exodus in its entire history. It is very slow in mastering the art of political struggle in conditions of an effective multiparty system. Thus, during the election campaign communists often competed among themselves, the result being that their political adversaries were elected to the soviets.

When speaking of the complex and tense situation within the party and society as a whole, the speakers identified the serious miscalculations on the part of the CPSU Central Committee and the country's government in the course of perestroyka itself among the reasons for this. The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's government have also permitted many mistakes. In the opinion of the keynote speaker and certain other speakers, these consist above all in the fact that these leading bodies were insufficiently critical of the center's decisions, failed to predict their possible social consequences, and failed to show the requisite determination and courage in upholding the republic's interests. This was clearly manifest in the situation over the Chernobyl tragedy when the republic's leadership was unable to counter departmental diktat, and all measures relating to people's radiation safety and the availability of information were determined by the center and the union government commission. This is not, unfortunately, an isolated example. This also explains the fact that its influence on partywide affairs does not accord with the Ukrainian Communist Party's position within the CPSU.

The renewal of the Ukrainian Communist Party, which numbers some 3,241,000 communists, is a crucial precondition for boosting its influence on the course of perestroyka. How do communists want to see their Communist Party? It must remain loyal to its socialist choice and the communist ideal, to creative Marxism-Leninism. In conditions of a multiparty system its social base is still the working people—the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. The party's political, ideological, and organizational functions must be given new substance.

Delegates stressed that the Communist Party's structure must finally be set on its foundation—the primary organizations. There are now 72,500 of the latter, but the significance of these links resides not only in their numbers, but above all in their closeness to people, to their interests and concerns, to vital, specific matters. The congress categorically opposed attempts to eliminate party organizations in production, in state establishments, in the Armed Forces, and in law-enforcement bodies.

The nature of cadre work is changing radically, which by no means signifies that it is slackening off. It is a case of renouncing excessive centralization, manifestations of subjectivism, secrecy, and other unsavory features which frequently accompanied the resolution of cadre questions.

There must be a fresh approach, delegates said, to the formation of all party structures. They must, undoubtedly, be improved, but in the interests of the cause, without succumbing to soapbox pressure. It is advisable to resolve questions of amalgamating or eliminating individual party gorkoms and raykoms on the basis of the specific situation, directing attention to the need to cooperate with the soviets of people's deputies at the corresponding level.

From the very outset, "Democratic Platform" representatives made their presence felt at the congress. The delegates considered it natural and logical for alternative positions to be represented, yet at the same time they condemned the lack of political discrimination and compromises on fundamental issues. It was underlined that the party must resolutely defend itself against factionalism and preserve itself as a single political organism.

The new sociopolitical situation, speakers pointed out, envisages the broadening of Ukrainian Communist Party independence. This is not in order to satisfy anyone's ambitions. The main thing is for the Communist Party to be able to assume responsibility for resolving tasks relating to the republic's political, socioeconomic, and spiritual development, determine priorities, and choose ways of putting partywide decisions into effect without looking over its shoulder to the center. All this is conditional upon the affirmation of Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] state sovereignty.

On this premise the question of the Ukrainian Communist Party Statute was also submitted for consideration. Opinions were divided prior to the congress as to the advisability of adopting the statute during the discussion within primary party organizations, at party conferences, and Central Committee plenums. This was also reflected at the congress.

Questions of ideological work occupied a significant part of both the report and the speeches. This subject was primarily treated in a critical manner. It is a fact, many delegates pointed out, that the party has met with a frenzied onslaught from anticommunist propaganda in a state of ideological demobilization. Today one can say that anticommunism as an ideopolitical trend has become quite a real phenomenon in the country's and republic's internal political life. It is impossible to disregard the fact that liberal-bourgeois views have now occupied a definite place in the public consciousness. Superimposed on difficulties in economic and social development, they are generating an extraordinarily dangerous phenomenon—occasionally subconscious common or garden anticommunism. The anticommunists' desire to make use of the processes of national revival, to give them a nationalist, chauvinistic hue where possible, and to once again turn them against CPSU policy attracts attention.

Of late a considerable number of critical shots have been fired at the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee regarding its attitude to various unofficial politicized associations, particularly Rukh. It was noted at the congress that it has not proved possible to avoid certain tactical miscalculations, definite muddle and lack of coordination in the actions of individual party organizations, and loss of the sense of proportion among some communists. At the initial stages, Rukh's organizers categorically denied that it could actually become a political party, a rival to the CPSU. Today this is not open to doubt. In the recent elections Rukh effectively became the base of the bloc opposing the Ukrainian Communist Party. That is political reality for you.

Of course, the line of constructive dialogue must be pursued along with criticism and political analysis of practical actions in the future in relations with political parties. But it was stressed that there can be no consolidation "at all" without a clearly-defined goal.

The question of Ukrainian state sovereignty held a prominent place in the report and a number of the speeches. We see it, the speakers said, as full power for the republic's people on their territory, supremacy, autonomy, full indivisible power, the right to independently settle questions relating to political, economic, and cultural life in the republic and to determine the forms and structure of organs of state power and government, the priority of republic laws, the cessation of the operation of union laws outside the bounds of the Union's competence, the inviolability of the republic's territory, and the emergence of the Ukraine as a real subject of international relations. We must, of course, act on the basis of life's realities on the way to sovereign Ukrainian statehood, it was said from the congress rostrum. Any hasty decisions without reliable forecasting, profound analysis, and consideration of the political situations both within the USSR and in Europe and the world would be no more than an adventure.

While discussing the problem of socioeconomic policy at the congress, the participants in the debates focused it on man and categorically objected to the recommendations foisted on them by various opponents—to abandon party interference in economic life and the elaboration and implementation of economic programs. It was repeated that the economy has been and will remain one of the Ukrainian Communist Party's concerns.

Discussing a broad range of problems, speakers, responding to the keynote speaker's appeal to make a critical assessment of the work done by the Central Committee, did not stint in pointing out the shortcomings. However, criticism was directed at the center, at Moscow, most of all. The report did not name a single specific culprit from the [Ukrainian Communist Party] Politburo or the Central Committee Secretariat who had made blunders or had failed. Those who followed the keynote speaker to the rostrum took the beaten track. The example of A. Korniyenko, Kiev party gorkom first secretary, is a typical one. Speaking about omissions in ideological work, he slated V.A. Medvedev and A.N. Yakovlev while referring in general terms to Ukrainian ideologues, and only the hubbub in the hall made him mention specific names. This vague criticism prompted the audience to demand personal reports from leaders of the republic party organization. Some had already taken the rostrum. Whereas L.M. Kravchuk, Central Committee secretary, had something to say and spoke convincingly, from the heart, the formal hackneyed speech from I.G. Grintsov, Central Committee secretary, was frankly "slammed."

V.A. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, delivered the closing address.

After discussing the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee report on the political situation and the main avenues for the Ukrainian Communist Party's activity at the contemporary stage, the congress deemed the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee's political line to be correct on the whole, but deemed the practical work of implementing it inadequate. The congress is continuing its work.

Ukraine People's Movement Great Council Meets

LD2406153490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1357 GMT 24 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Pariyskiy]

[Text] Kiev, 24 Jun (TASS)—The two-day session of the Great Council of the Ukrainian People's Movement for

Perestroyka [Rukh], which ended here today, discussed the main trends in Rukh's activity for the immediate and long-term future. The leaders of the movement's regional organizations are members of the Great Council.

After giving his report "On the Political Situation in Ukraine and the Tasks of Rukh," poet Ivan Drach, the chairman of the council said that the People's Movement is striving to become the center that unites all the democratic forces of the republic. Noting the difficult situation that has arisen in the public and economic life of Ukraine, he said that Rukh calls for all democrats to consolidate and cooperate constructively.

The session also discussed issues of the republic's Russian-speaking population and some problems of the activities of Rukh's regional organizations and of expanding their influence on public life. Additions to Rukh's program and charter were examined.

The Great Council deemed it expedient to hold extensive celebrations of the 500th anniversary of the formation of the Zaporozhskaya Sech, an organization of Ukrainian Cossacks, within the framework of which the first elements of Ukrainian statehood were created.

The participants in the Great Council session decided to convene an all-Ukrainian assembly of the People's Movement of Ukraine for Perestroyka in fall of this year.

Simferopol Issues Statement on Crimean Tatars

LD2606214290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Jun 90

[text] A statement was adopted at the session of the Simferopol Oblast soviet. It contains criticism over the delay in deciding the question connected with the organized resettlement of Crimean Tatars to their homeland. The session participants addressed the proposal to the state commission on problems of the Crimean Tatar people that the examination of the immediate measures be accelerated. An appeal to the Crimean Tatar people calling upon them to display restraint, to understand the real situation which has arisen in the oblast, and to end the picketing of the building of the executive committees and the seizure of lands was also adopted. Deputies called upon inhabitants of the Crimea to decide all questions of relations between the nationalities in the spirit of internationalism and benevolence.

Crimean Tatars To Broadcast in Native Language

OW2706070690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jun 90

[V. Plotnikov video report; from the "120 Minutes" program]

[Text] Today we would like to congratulate our Crimean colleagues on the beginning of regular television broadcasts in the Crimean Tatar language.

[Video cuts to show unidentified broadcaster in a studio, speaking in Crimean Tatar, switching to Russian] Hello and good evening, dear viewers. And now I will continue our segment in my native language. Our guest on today's program is Enver Sidametovich Akhmulayev, an associate professor at Simferopol State University and a candidate of philology.

[Video shows broadcaster Akhmulayev speaking Crimean Tatar with Plotnikov translating in Russian] Enver Sidametovich says that the Crimean Tatar language is once again being studied in the homeland of its people. For two years it has been taught in over a hundred schools, and although there are not enough specialists and textbooks, we hope to overcome these difficulties. Crimean Tatar language and literature teachers are training at the university in Simferopol and at the Yalta Preparatory School. An oblast newspaper is being published. The works of Crimean Tatar writers are in bookstores and libraries.

It is curious that, although the new broadcast has yet to air, it has already received a number of letters. The writers wish them success, suggest themes, and bring up problems, such as the acute shortage of housing, village plots, and building materials.

Beginning with the very first program, the producers promise to devote particular attention to national culture and arts. So in practically every city and region in the oblast, clubs and studios have already been formed to study the folk traditions of the Crimean Tatars. The best of these will participate in the first folk festival of the peoples of the Crimea.

We wish the journalists and all the originators of the new program creative successes.

'Official Status' Given to 'Odessa Free Town'

PM2606131390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 90 p 1

[TASS correspondent V. Veprik report: "Live and Prosper"]

[Text] Odessa—The Coordinating Council and Board of Directors of the "Odessa Free Town" Enterprise has been granted official status by the City Soviet of People's Deputies. This means that the implementation of the project for setting up an economic free zone in the Black Sea region has begun. A creative collective of academics under the Odessa Department of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Academy of Sciences Economics Institute has been working on this project for several years.

Redeployment Poses Housing Problems in Belorussia

PM2606142390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Correspondent Colonel A. Belousov dispatch from the Belorussian Military District under "Direct Line" rubric: "Where Are the Officers To Live?"]

[Text] As already reported in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, a group of USSR people's deputies and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions, together with representatives of the USSR Ministry of Defense and other ministries and departments, is studying the situation in the military districts to which the troops being withdrawn from the East European countries will be redeployed. In particular, much is being done to receive the troops in the Belorussian Military District, which deputies visited. Installations and premises are being prepared here for the equipment. A start is being made on apartment blocks, schools, and kindergartens, or they are already under construction. Barracks are being refitted as housing for the families of officers and warrant officers, and modules and panelboard houses are being assembled. Generally, as Lieutenant General P. Ledyayev, deputy chief of the district's Combat Training Directorate, remarked, no one will be left without a roof over his head. However, it must be said bluntly that the prospect of living with their families in prefabricated panelboard houses does not overjoy officers and warrant officers who have each served 10-15 years or but have not managed to earn decent housing.

A whole series of other problems also arises. For instance, how are normal medical and goods supplies to be ensured for the rayon city when its population is significantly increased owing to the arrival of the troops? How are the above-mentioned prefabricated houses to be supplied with heat and water when the city's capacities are already working at the limit? In the opinion of USSR People's Deputies M. Zokirov, V. Lukin, and Colonel V. Podziruk, with whom I spoke, it is quite impossible for the Ministry of Defense to do everything. The local authorities also have extremely limited possibilities. Therefore government aid is needed.

A meeting of members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions with the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] leadership was held 21 June. The discussion was difficult. S. Shushkevich, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, V. Yevtukh, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, and I. Smolyar, chairman of a Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet standing commission, noted that the housing situation in the republic is complex. Thousands of families who suffered after the tragedy at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station are waiting to be moved out of the disaster area. It is also surprising, they said, that the decision on the redeployment of troops on Belorussian territory was not coordinated with the republic's leadership. Nevertheless, a way out of the difficult situation that has emerged over the troop withdrawal must be found. Meeting with the USSR people's deputies, Colonel General A. Kostenko, commander of the Belorussian Military District, described the situation that has arisen in the district and answered their questions.

Belorussian National Democratic Party Founded

LD2506174790 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 25 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Glod]

[Text] Minsk June 25 TASS—The revival of the Belorussian nation and the national self-awareness is the main goal of the national Democratic Party of Belorussia, whose constituent conference ended here on Sunday. Its participants expressed the intention to work for true political independence of Belorussia.

So far as relations with the Union are concerned, a range of views on this problem was rather wide—from the withdrawal from the USSR to the creation of confederation. Some delegates proposed to withdraw from the Soviet Union and then to establish equitable treaty-based relations in policy, economy and culture. Other favour confederation uniting Baltic republics, Belorussia and the Ukraine. Still others prefer to remain part of the USSR. The stands will be defined more clearly during the working out of the party's programme, which is still outlining general directions of its activities.

The overwhelming majority of delegates to the constituent conference were Belorussian writers, artists and film-makers.

Moldavian Communist Party Holds Session

LD2606111790 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 10 Jun 90 p 1

[Text] The new Moldavian Communist Party Bureau has held its first working session. It considered measures to propagandize and explain the documents of the 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress and the measures to put into effect critical observations and suggestions expressed by congress delegates and town and rayon party conferences.

The decision which was adopted on this matter notes that the 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress was an important event in republican public life. It demonstrated the ability of the republican party organization to learn the lessons of the past, to comprehend the times in which we are living, and to bring together communists and all strata of the population in the interests of resolving the tasks of perestroyka.

Departments of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, town and rayon party committees have been instructed to implement specific measures to put into practice numerous critical observations and suggestions from delegates. The majority of those suggestions were frank and sharp and imbued with concern for the wellbeing of the people, the fate of the party and socialism, and directed towards overcoming the way in which the republican party organization lags behind the processes occuring in society and towards strengthening the ideological and organizational unity of party ranks and a radical improvement in the activities of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, its bureau and apparatus.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has resolved to submit to the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet as a legislative initiative a proposal to decree 31 August, the day on which the Law of the Moldavian SSR on the state language was adopted, a "Limba Noastre" ["Our Language"] holiday. Confidence was expressed that the "Limba Noastre" holiday would be a noteworthy event in the republic's spiritual life and would have a positive effect on the revival of Moldavian culture and improve relations among nationalities on the way towards full civic accord. An organizational committee to prepare for and stage the holiday was endorsed.

The Central Committee Bureau session considered the matter of making a political assessment of the tragic consequences of the famine of 1946-7 in the Moldavian SSR.

In the course of the debate it was noted that, thanks to the democratization and glasnost launched by the perestroyka revolution, the ban on thorough coverage of many little-researched historical events, including the severe drought and the subsequent terrible famine of 1946-7 which caused the death of masses of people, had been lifted. The decision which was adopted, to be published in the press, recognized that the famine of 1946-7 was a real tragedy for the Moldavian people and resulted from Stalinist command and administrative system and the policy of the Central Committee Bureau of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on Moldavia in regard to the peasantry—as well as from the drought.

Taking account of the fundamental changes taking place in present-day public life and the renewal of the party, determining new approaches to the ideological-theoretical and psychological- pedagogical training of the party and ideological activists and of the raised political culture of communists, the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has decided to turn the House of Political Education of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee into the Center for Political Culture of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, abolishing courses for raising the qualifications of party, local soviet and ideological cadres and the University of Marxism-Leninism of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee. The decision adopted on this matter makes provision for the political education offices of town and rayon party committees to be turned into branches of the Center for Political Culture.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau considered the matter of a new structure for the apparatus of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee in order to improve this, the organizational and party work, ideological, relations among nationalities, state and legal, agrarian, socio-economic, and the general departments have been abolished. All work on drawing up and implementing party policy is being concentrated in the organizational, ideological, socio-economic, and agrarian commissions created by the plenum of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, in each of which groups will be formed on specific problems concerning the most important aspects of the work, in which scientists and specialists will be involved, in addition to party workers who have been released and members of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee. This will make it possible to work out a new model for relations between the apparatus and members of elected party bodies.

The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau also considered several other matters of party life.

Report on Moldavian 'Declaration of Sovereignty'

PM2606155390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Eduard Kondratov: "Declaration of Moldova's Sovereignty"]

[Text] Kishinev—The SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova is a sovereign state. So says the Declaration on the Sovereignty of the SSR of Moldova adopted by the republic's Supreme Soviet session after many hours of heated debate.

There were many differences of opinion. A majority in parliament rejected the amendment of the "Soviet Moldavia" deputies' group, which pressed for the inclusion of the clarification "as part of the Soviet Union" in the text, following the words about a sovereign state. Supreme Soviet Chairman M. Snegur and his deputy, V. Pushkash, explained that the absence of this clarification is due to the fact that the status of the future community of sovereign republics, which will set the seal on their relations with the Union treaty, has not yet been defined, so it should not be perceived as an intention on Moldova's part to secede from the USSR.

According to the declaration, the land, minerals, and natural resources, and the entire economic, scientific-technical, and financial potential are the republic's exclusive property. Union laws will operate on its territory only after they have been ratified by the Moldavian parliament. It states the right of the SSR of Moldova both to join unions of states and to withdraw from them, to have plenipotentiaries outside the republic, and to participate in the European cooperation and security process and also in European structures.

Some of the deputies objected to the article in the declaration which declared Moldova to be a demilitarized zone, but the majority voted in favor. The demand by Russian-speaking deputies to include in the article on republican citizenship a point on Moldova's residents retaining USSR citizenship also did not meet with support.

The adopted declaration will form the basis for the elaboration of the future Constitution of the SSR of Moldova and preparations for signing the Union treaty with the community of sovereign states.

As an addendum to the declaration of sovereignty, on the deputies' insistence, the session listened to the findings of the commission set up three days ago to make a legal and historical assessment of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact and the secret protocols of 1939-1940. After a fierce debate with the deputies of the "Soviet Moldavia" group, the parliamentarians approved it. The entry of Soviet troops into Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina in June 1940 was described as an instance of occupation and Stalinist aggression and a manifestation of USSR imperial diktat. By no means everyone voted for this. Several dozen delegates from rayons beyond the Dnestr left the hall of sessions, refusing to participate in the discussion of the document.

The session decided that 28 June will no longer be celebrated in Moldova as liberation day. The "Limba Noastre" ("Our Language") festival on 31 August in honor of the laws declaring Moldavian the state language will be a holiday. It was announced that the streets in Kishinev named for 28 June, Pavlik Morozov, and Korovskiy have been renamed.

The session adjourned for a month.

Caucasus

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Begins Debates 26 Jun

LD2606205390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Correspondent M. Mamedov video report from Baku on the 26 June opening session of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A whole package of draft laws, the adoption of which would play an important part in the sociopolitical and socioeconomic life of Azerbaijan, was submitted for consideration by the deputies. [video shows deputies talking in foyer, then various auditorium scenes throughout]

Among the 25 items on the agenda, one of the most important is the draft law on the election of people's deputies of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the draft law on the election of deputies to the local soviets. As speakers pointed out, they are undoubtedly more democratic and will enable virtually all political organizations, which are quite numerous today throughout the republic, to take part in this important political campaign. And these laws were unanimously endorsed.

Heated debates flared up during discussion of the draft law on the republic's economic independence. Deputies said that Azerbaijan, which possesses large reserves of raw materials and a developed industry and agriculture, is unable to benefit from these advantages owing to the diktat of Union ministries and departments. Today, the republic exports more output than it imports. This, naturally, affects the social position of the working people. Economic independence must be founded on equitable treaties with all the Union republics belonging to the federation. The deputies decided to publish the draft law on economic independence in the pages of the republican papers for nationwide discussion.

Election Decision Adopted

LD2606225290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1750 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Report by TASS-AZERINFORM correspondents Gekkhekkhanum Tagiyev and Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku, 26 June (TASS)—At the session of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet which took place in Baku today, a decision was adopted on holding the elections of people's deputies of the republic and of deputies of local soviets on 2 September.

Azerbaijan will hold elections later than the other Soviet republics, for a state of emergency, introduced in January of this year, is in force here. Now, the situation in the republic, in its capital, has stabilized, which has made it possible to put forward at the session the question of the election of a new composition of the supreme body of state power in Azerbaijan; 360 deputies' mandates are being instituted in the republican Supreme Soviet instead of the present 450.

Elmira Kafarova, chairperson of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, reported that over 80,000 people have taken part in the discussion of the draft laws on elections published in September of last year. These drafts have absorbed the experience of the electoral campaign in other union republics, and, in her opinion, for the first time, the elections, with the adoption of the laws, will turn into a real factor of political life, and will not be a mere formality. The changes and additions to the laws are aimed at reviving the principle of the sovereignty of the people. For the first time, multimandate constituencies are envisaged along with single-mandate ones.

A whole package of new draft laws, called upon to play a most important role in the sociopolitical life of the republic, to further the real implementation of perestroyka, of political and economic reforms, was also presented for examination by the deputies.

Draft laws on the economic independence of Azerbaijan, on ownership in the republic and on leasing, and also the draft of the land codex of Azerbaijan, have been handed over for nationwide discussion.

Azerbaijan's Kafarova Criticizes Armenian Deputies

NC2405132890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 22 May 90

[Text] El'mira Kafarova, chairwoman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, has sent a letter to Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The letter said:

A deep feeling of uneasiness was expressed during the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet meeting on 18 May 1990 in connection with the activities of several USSR deputies who tries to undermine the decisions adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet and disrupt the effort made by Azerbaijan SSR's Nagorno-Karabakh Organization Committee to normalize the relations between the Armenian and Azerbaijani peoples in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO].

Balayan, Dadamyan, Grigoryan, Pogosyan, and Gabriyelyan, USSR people's deputies from the NKAO in Azerbaijan SSR, have clearly indicated that they are not interested in quickly eliminating the dispute in the NKAO. They regard the hardships of thousands of people as [word indistinct] in political maneuvering. It has been clearly understood that they are pursuing an intentional policy aimed at maintaining tension between the two republics, complicating the situation in the NKAO, and placing the question described as the NKAO problem on the agenda of new forums and meetings. Using their immunity as deputies, these citizens are calling on the people of the oblast to engage in popular disobedience and to resort to forceful measures. Furthermore, they are making strong remarks against the people and leaders of Azerbaijan and spreading calumnies and fabrications. They are also calling for convening meetings of the NKAO people's deputies soviet, that is, regardless of the fact that its illegal election campaign for the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet and other illegal activities have been halted. Also, they are engaging in other illegal activities under the state of emergency conditions.

Meanwhile, undeserving calumnies are being leveled against the military command headquarters, the internal troops, and the Soviet armed forces. These groups are conscientiously fulfilling their duties in the NKAO with by being self-sacrificing.

Furthermore, these USSR deputies are calling for resistance against the significant and practical work carried out by the members of the republic's NKAO Organization Committee headed by Viktor Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

The irresponsible and instigating statements made in the mass media organs and in public speeches and other activities have clearly indicated that USSR people's deputies Balayan, Dadamyan, Grigoryan, Pogosyan, and Gabriyelyan, who took part in the National Council [in the NKAO], which was previously disbanded and declared illegal, stubbornly maintain a position aimed at systematically provoking interethnic discord and forcibly disrupting Azerbaijan SSR's territorial integrity. These individuals, who have been elected as people's deputies by the responsible people in the regions in which the representatives of various nationalities live, have committed treachery against the principles of socialist internationalism. Furthermore, they have become agitators for hostility against thousands of their Azerbaijani voters.

In view of the many appeals conveyed to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium calling for the withdrawal of these deputies, I move to ask you to consider the establishment of a USSR Supreme Soviet committee to assess the anticonstitutional activities of these deputies because, according to Articles 63 and 67 of the criminal code of Azerbaijan, these individuals should be brought to account for their activities aimed at disrupting the equality of the national rights of the citizens, provoking interethnic discord, and forcibly disrupting Azerbaijan SSR's territorial integrity.

Transcaucasus Refugees To Receive Compensation

PM2606152990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with P. Rudev, chief of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems Migration and Resettlement Administration, by IZVESTIYA correspondent G. Alimov under the rubric "Details for IZVESTIYA"; place, date unspecified: "Refugees To Get Compensation"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] At long last the hundreds of thousands of people forced to abandon their permanent abode are going to get a clear answer to the question of how they are to be compensated for the apartments and houses they have left behind them and the property they have lost. Together with the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers and the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Ministry of Finance, USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, USSR Ministry of Justice, and USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs have defined the procedure for registering housing and other premises belonging to refugees, assessing the material damage, and paying compensation. P. Rudev, chief of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems Migration and Resettlement Administration, answered IZVESTIYA's questions.

[Alimov] Petr Sergeyevich, let us begin with the main issue: There are now 230,000 refugees in Armenia, 200,000 in Azerbaijan, and tens of thousands of people have gone to other union republics, mainly Russia, but many still do not know where they should take their questions about compensation. They telephone and write to the editorial office. Whose responsibility are they?

[Rudev] They are the responsibility of the local soviet executive committee in the refugees' new permanent place of residence. The right to compensation extends to those who have decided where they are going to live and work from now on. Four copies of the completed application form—these have now been prepared and distributed—must be sent to the soviet executive committee concerned, plus registration documents for the new place of residence and a statement renouncing all rights to housing and other premises at the old address.

[Alimov] And what kind of information must be supplied in the application form?

[Rudev] Passport information, detailed information on the abandoned accommodation—total area, for example, and the size of share contributions for a cooperative apartment.... There is also a separate section on farm buildings, property lost, fruit and berry plantations, agricultural livestock, means of transport....

On receiving the completed application forms, the local soviet executive committee must enter information on how the applicant's housing situation is being resolved: Whether he has been allocated a plot of land to build his own home, or whether he has perhaps joined a housing or housing construction cooperative, or whether he has been authorized to buy an apartment or individual housing. These documents must be sent either to the Azerbaijan SSR State Committee for Work With Persons Forced To Leave Their Place of Permanent Residence or to the Armenian SSR State Committee for the Reception and Settlement of Returning Armenians, as appropriate. They will then be forwarded to the rayon and city soviet executive committees in citizens' previous place of residence to verify the information given. These republics will pay the necessary compensation from their own budgets to the accounts of the local soviet executive committees indicated in the application forms.

[Alimov] What kind of procedure is being established for making payment?

[Rudev] The same executive committees must return one copy of the application form to the refugee concerned and organize payment. A provision has been made for this payment to take the form of cash or written order, as the applicant chooses.

[Alimov] Has the amount of compensation been decided? What is it to be based on?

[Rudev] Compensation of expenditure on acquiring or, for example, building individual or cooperative housing or purchasing an apartment is to be calculated on the basis of R210 per square meter of the total area of the abandoned apartment, but no more than 16 square meters in total per person. If several lessees lived in the apartment, compensation will be calculated on the basis of the same norms, proceeding from the total living space they occupied and the corresponding part of subsidiary premises.

Housing, apartments, and other premises to which citizens have right of ownership and which they were forced to abandon will also be bought from them on the basis of R210 per square meter of the total area. Dachas, summerhouses, garages, and farm buildings will be bought on the basis of insurance documents or valuation norms for compulsory state insurance.

In all cases the total compensation or purchase payment (not counting dachas, summerhouses, garages, and farm buildings) must be no less than R7,000 per family.

[Alimov] And is compensation envisaged for household effects and so forth?

[Rudev] Yes. Compensation of the value of household effects, fruit and berry plantations, and even uninsured agricultural livestock is to be calculated as follows: R1,200 for single citizens; R2,000 for two-person families; and R500 for every subsequent member of the family. This compensation is to be paid regardless of the sum liable under voluntary insurance of household effects.

Georgia Adopts Sovereignty, Labor Service Laws

PM2606134390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kaushanskiy under "Direct Line" rubric: "Package of Documents"]

[Text] Tbilisi, 22 Jun—An extraordinary session of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has been held in Tbilisi; it has been convened a month earlier than scheduled in connection with the demands of a number of social and political organizations.

A decision was adopted on amending the 9 March 1990 Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Guarantees of the Protection of the State Sovereignty of Georgia."

The Law on the Fundamentals of Georgia's Economic Independence was adopted at the first reading. A Law On Alternative (Labor) Service was also on the whole approved. Evidently, the law's details remain to be elaborated, and in the mean time I will note only the gist of it. Deputy V. Sharashenidze, Georgian SSR justice minister, explained from the platform that the task is to adopt a law on alternative civilian service for people who do not wish to do military service on religious, ideological, moral, or political grounds. The minister stressed that the republic Ministry of Justice had drawn up three drafts which took into consideration both the experience of European countries and broad public opinion.

Georgian Popular Front Congress Opens 27 Jun

LD2706094990 Moscow TASS in English 0931 GMT 27 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Devi Berdzenishvili and Boris Gassayev]

[Text] Tbilisi June 27 TASS—The Second Congress of the Georgian Popular Front opened here today. It will sum up the results of the work of the Popular Front formed a year ago. The front set itself the tasks of achieving full sovereignty for the republic and building democratic society. On the agenda of the Congress are the re-election of the leading bodies of the Popular Front and amending its programme and charter. "We must realistically assess the conditions in the republic and adopt new tactics, Nodar Natadze, chairman of the Georgian Popular Front, told TASS. [no end quotes as received]

"We believe that the decisions of the recent extraordinary session of the Georgian parliament were very important. It adopted a package of legislative acts which can be assessed as a real step towards democracy in the republic. At the same time it is necessary to take into account a conflict between Georgian political forces as well as ethnic problems that still exist," he said.

"The congress should work out a programme of actions aimed at removing these conflicts, since real sovereignty and democracy cannot be achieved without consolidation," he said.

Central Asia

Kazakh Communist Party Politburo Elected 10 Jun

LD2606103890

[Editorial Report] Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian on 10 June reports on page 1 that a plenum of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee has elected a Politburo of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee. It names its members and publishes their photographs. They are as follows:

N.A. Nazarbayev	first secretary and Politburo member
V.G. Anufriyev	second secretary and Politburo member
Ye.M. Asanbayev	Politburo member
S.M. Bayzhanov	Politburo member and secretary
V.I. Dvurechenskiy	Politburo member and secretary
U.D. Dzhanibekov	Politburo member and secretary
U.K. Karamanov	Politburo member
G.Ya. Kozlov	Politburo member
L.N. Kolbik [female]	Politburo member
Ye.N. Neverovskiy	Politburo member
Yu.D. Netesov	Politburo member
T.I. Ruzakhunov	Politburo member
K.Kh. Tyulebekov	Politburo member
O.A. Abdykarimov	candidate Politburo member
E.M. Zhakselekov	candidate Politburo member
I.N. Tasmagambetov	candidate Politburo member

Kazakh Head of State Committee Appointed

LD2606200190 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1400 GMT 21 Jun 90

[Text] By the decree of the president of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], Sayat Dyusenbay-ogly Beysenov has been appointed chairman of the Kazakh SSR State Committee for Labor and Social Affairs. He was released from his duties as Kazakh SSR minister of consumer services.

Frunze Official Views Current Situation

LD2606120390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] The repercussions of the tragic events that took place in Kirghizia at the start of the month are not dying down. This is not surprising. I was in Osh, Uzgen, and Frunze at the time and I can state as an eyewitness that the drama did not simply unfold within individual families but affected hundreds of thousands of people. It should be remembered that wounds of the spirit take far longer to heal than those of the body. What, then, is going on in Kirghizia right now? Our correspondent Aleksandr Mirtov interviewed Militia Colonel (Feliks Sharshambayevich Kul), he is commandant of Frunze and first deputy minister of internal affairs of the Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

[Begin recording] [Mirtov] How do you think the situation can be stabilized?

[(Kul)] I have to say that in Frunze, if we are talking about the capital of our republic, the situation is stable and there are no grounds for thinking it might deteriorate. However, I believe that it could deteriorate in response to what happens in Osh Oblast. A great deal depends on how the formalization process takes place in Osh Oblast. I should then like to stress that it is essential that we find all the culprits—the USSR Procuracy is helping us to do this—in order to put an end to innuendo and conjecture and to show a true picture of who organized it [the disturbances] and how. We do know that elements organized beforehand, to put it mildly, were present in this situation. Given a calm and organized situation, I think that we should be guided toward solving the economic and social problems that exist in that area. I mean here, above all, the matter of unemployment. There is very high unemployment there. This is a serious problem and it must be solved. In solving that problem we do not, unfortunately, see everything clearly.

Another matter which I think is essential to tackle is a matter of a political nature, of the state structure. I mean that somehow borders need to be clearly defined. We need to sit down in a comradely and brotherly manner to solve this issue. Evidently, it is untraditional methods that need to be found, holding a joint legislative sitting, perhaps. I hope that these problems will be successfully solved although, and I repeat, there are many complications. [end recording]

Uzbek, Kirghiz Ministers Meet in Tashkent

LD2606132790 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 25 Jun 90

[Excerpts] In Tashkent, a working meeting took place of the ministers for internal affairs of the Uzbek and Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

Goncharov, the minister for internal affairs of the Kirghiz SSR, discussed the steps which are being taken in the republic to stabilize the situation, in connection with the events in the Osh Oblast, now the investigations are being carried out regarding the criminal cases of rape, fires, and massacres, and what is being done in charging and arresting the instigators and active participants of the massive disturbances.

They also touched upon questions on the search of the people lost [word indistinct] in the clashes on the territory of Osh Oblast.

Kamalov, the Uzbek SSR internal affairs minister, informed his colleague that the sad events which took place in part of the town of Osh, [word indistinct] Alayskiy, Karasuyskiy, and other rayons have given rise to a dangerously explosive situation. In connection with the decree of the president of the republic, a state of emergency was declared in five of the rayons of the Andizhan Oblast. [passage omitted]

A great deal of attention was given to the question of maintaining tranquility on the borders of both republics, the widening of joint work in this direction. The ministers exchanged views on improving the activities of the organs for internal affairs, and the question of setting up a municipal police force was raised and the necessity, in connection with this, of a new approach for the cooperation of the organs for internal affairs. An agreement was reached on carrying out such meetings on regular basis.